CATHOLICS AND EDUCATION

UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
3 1761 01995493 2

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/catholicseducati00londuoft

Ex Libris
F. D. Mueller
ST. PAUL'S SEMINARY
TRANSFERRED
UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE
LIBRARY

TRANSFERRED

371.1
C

CATHOLICS AND EDUCATION

EX LIBRIS
ST. BASIL'S SCHOLASTICATE
2086 No. TX80.5 9/11/31



LONDON
CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY
69, SOUTHWARK BRIDGE ROAD, S.E.
1908

MAY 12 1954

CONTENTS

THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1902: THE DIFFICULTY AND ITS SOLUTION. By the Archbishop of Westminster.

THE CATHOLIC ATTITUDE ON THE EDUCATION QUESTION. By the same.

THE MAINTENANCE OF RELIGION IN THE SCHOOL. By the same.

CATHOLIC EDUCATION AND THE DUTIES OF PARENTS. By the Bishop of Clifton.

THE EDUCATION BILL. By the Very Rev. Canon Glancey.

THE CATHOLIC ASPECT OF THE EDUCATION QUESTION. By Bertram C. A. Windle, M.D., F.R.S.

THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES. By the Rev. Joseph Rickaby, S.J.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOLS. By Robert J. Smythe.

EDUCATION, TRUE AND FALSE. By William Samuel Lilly.

P.22.

NOTE

THE following pamphlets on the attitude of Catholics towards Education in general, and especially in relation to threatened legislation, past and future, have been published by the Catholic Truth Society, and are now brought together for the convenience of those who may like to possess them in a collected form.

January, 1908

THE EDUCATION ACT OF 1902

THE DIFFICULTY AND ITS SOLUTION[1]

By

HIS GRACE THE ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER

You must be almost weary by this time of hearing of the Education Question. For years we have been calling out for a resetting of the position of our schools. For years, too, we have been watching, and criticizing, and striving to amend the efforts of the Legislature to effect that readjustment. For many months our attention has been fixed on the results of those efforts, and no one can yet say what phase the question will next assume. Whether we be weary or not of the whole subject, we can never forget it. It forces itself continually upon our notice. Our interests as Catholics in the matter of education are so great that until some satisfactory solution is found—if that day will ever come—we must be alive to every change, actual or imminent, and we must not allow ourselves to be distracted from the subject by any weariness or any disappointment. You will

[1] Inaugural Address at the Catholic Conference held at Birmingham, September 26–28, 1904.

pardon me, therefore, if I take for the subject of my address to you to-night the results of the Education Act of 1902.

I.

The Good of the Act.

I think that we may say boldly that this Act is a great step in advance in the general educational prospects of the country. A spirit of method and of co-ordination is brought into the national education which must certainly have the most far-reaching results. The complicated control of the Education Department and of the Science and Art Department, and of the Charity Commission, and of the School Boards has been unified and simplified, and for the first time primary and secondary and technical education with all their subdivisions have been brought under one authority, whose duty it will be to see that they stand in proper relation to one another.

Again, the training of teachers is at last receiving the attention which it deserves, and new avenues of usefulness are being opened up to those who desire to enter on the profession of teaching, while adequate remuneration is provided to stimulate their energy.

Moreover opportunities are being afforded, and they will every day increase, whereby those who have talent but small means will nevertheless be able by means of scholarships to avail themselves of every educational advantage that the country has at its disposal.

But more important than all these reforms is the

spirit which is animating them, a spirit very different from that which we were once accustomed to associate with the Department. A glance at the "Introduction" prefixed to the Education Code for 1904, or at the Regulations for Secondary Schools, will be sufficient indication of what I mean. It is now clearly recognized that the main object of education is not to give instruction in certain subjects and to enable children to pass muster at examination, but to train the character and develop the intelligence of the children and to fit them for the work of life. Teachers are reminded how it is their duty to implant in the children habits of industry, self-control, and courageous perseverance in the face of difficulties. They are to teach them to reverence what is noble, to be ready for self-sacrifice, and to strive their utmost after purity and truth. Again, due recognition is given to the fact that great freedom must be allowed to secondary schools to work upon the lines either bequeathed by tradition or suggested by local circumstances, and that hard and fast rules would impede and not advance the educational progress of the country.

On all these grounds I think that we have reason to be grateful to the promoters of the legislation of 1902, and to the framers of the various Acts and regulations which preceded or have followed that much-debated enactment. They have shown themselves keenly alive to the educational necessities of the country, and they have proved themselves to be men who know what real education is. The nation cannot but be the better for the important changes which have taken place.

II.

The Injustice of the Act of 1870.

Having said this much, and having recognized most fully, as I consider we are bound to do, all that is good and useful in the recent legislation, we are none the less obliged to confess that the Act of 1902 has not solved the great educational problem which has confronted and tormented the country for so many years. In order to show this, I will endeavour to establish three points :

(1) The Education Act of 1870 was in certain respects an unjust law ;

(2) The Education Act of 1902 has removed some of the inequalities created by the Act of 1870 ; but,

(3) It has left the fundamental injustice of that Act untouched.

1. Until 1870 the education of the country was not adequately provided for. Thousands of children were without education, and a remedy was urgently necessary. Voluntary effort had done much, and could do no more. The direct intervention of the State was required in order to make good the deficiencies which were recognized by all. But in carrying out this urgently needed reform a very great injustice was committed, and a privileged position was conferred upon those who had done little or nothing in the cause of education, while those who had made sacrifices of every kind were placed in a position of undeserved inferiority. In December, 1882, my great predecessor, Cardinal Manning, wrote

an article for the *Nineteenth Century* entitled, "Is the Education Act of 1870 a Just Law?" To make my meaning clear I will quote largely from that article, which sets forth in terms plainer than any one else could have chosen the fatal flaw of the system introduced by that Act:—

> The principles embodied in the Act of 1870 may be stated as follows:—
>
> 1. That education, whether by voluntary schools or by rate schools, shall be universal, and co-extensive with the needs of the whole population.
>
> 2. That an education rate shall be levied in all places where the existing schools are not sufficient for the population in number or in efficiency, and that such rate shall be administered by a board elected by the ratepayers.
>
> 3. That the standard of education shall be raised to meet the needs and gradations of the people.
>
> 4. That all schools receiving aid, whether by Government grant or by rate, shall be brought under the provisions of the statute law.
>
> 5. That all such schools shall be under inspection of Government, and bound by all minutes and codes of the Committee of Privy Council as sanctioned by Parliament.
>
> 6. Lastly, it has been since that date enacted that education, under certain conditions and for certain classes, be compulsory.
>
> Now, these principles have been so long admitted, and have worked themselves so deeply

into public opinion and daily practice, that no scheme or proposition at variance with them would be listened to.

The condition thus made for us being irreversible, our duty is to work upon it and to work onward from it for the future.

Assuming then that the principles of the Act of 1870 are good, and their results beneficial, the promoters of that Act cannot but desire that it should be carried out to its fullest extent. . . .

Putting away all ecclesiastical questions, it cannot be denied that the State is justified in providing for the education of its people. It has a right to protect itself from the dangers arising from ignorance and vice, which breed crime and turbulence. It has a duty also to protect children from the neglect and sin of parents, and to guard their rights to receive an education which shall fit them for human society and for civil life.

If the civil power has these rights and duties towards the people, it has the corresponding rights and powers to levy upon the people such taxes or rates as are necessary for the due and full discharge of such duties.

But correlative to these rights of the civil power are also the rights of the people. If the Government may tax the whole people for education, the whole people have a right to share in the beneficial use of such taxation. An education rate raised from the whole people ought to be returned to the whole people in a

form or in forms of education of which all may partake. If any one form of education can be found, in which all the people are content to share, let it be adopted ; if no one such form be possible, let there be as many varieties of form as can with reason be admitted. No one form of religious education would satisfy Catholics, Anglicans, Nonconformists, and unbelievers. No form whatsoever of merely secular instruction will satisfy the great majority, who believe that education without religion is impossible. Therefore, if no one form can be found to satisfy all, many and various forms of education ought to be equally admitted, and equally allowed to stand on the same ground before the law.

This does not mean that every individual or every caprice may claim a share in the education rate ; but that every association or body of men having public and distinct existence, already recognized by law, should be recognized also as a unit for the purposes of education, and, being so recognized, therefore admitted to a participation in the education rate ; reserving always to the Government its full inspection, and to the ratepayers their due control and audit of accounts. . . .

We may now go on to see in what the present way of carrying out the Act is open to the censure of inequality and injustice.

1. First of all, the exclusive enjoyment and control of the education rate is given to one only class of schools, which represent one and

only one form of opinion, and that form which is repugnant to the majority of the people of the United Kingdom, namely, that such schools should be only secular, to the exclusion of religion. The exclusion of religion excludes the vast majority of the people from those schools ; and such schools, being exclusive, are truly and emphatically sectarian. And here, lest I should seem not to know, or knowing, to omit to say, that the Bible is read now in the majority of board schools, I cite the fact to prove that religion is not taught in them. All doctrinal formularies and catechisms are expressly excluded by the Act of 1870. But religion without doctrine is like mathematics without axioms, or triangles without base or sides. I heartily rejoice that the life and words, and works, and death of the Divine Saviour of the world should be read by children. But that is not the teaching of religion, unless the true meaning and the due intrinsic worth of all these things be taught. But this would perforce be doctrinal Christianity, prohibited by law. There can be no mathematics without precise intellectual conceptions and adequate verbal expression. . . .

The Cardinal finally declares : "It would be difficult to find in all our recent history a more unequal and unjust condition." These words are true to-day as they were twenty-two years ago. I am willing to admit, if you like, that the old board schools gave more than secular instruction, and that

they endeavoured to impart a moral and religious basis of conduct. Be it so; then the inequality created by the Act of 1870 is all the greater, for it gives a privileged position to one form of religious teaching, which is repugnant to vast numbers of the people. Here, in a country which prides itself on its Christian character, the teaching of definite Christianity was refused the same recognition as that accorded to indefinite and indeterminate doctrines, and those who clung to it for the most conscientious motives were made to suffer for their convictions. Unwillingly, unwittingly very likely, the framers of the Act of 1870 introduced a system of unfair treatment of definite religious belief, against which we have protested for more than thirty years.

2. We readily admit that the Act of 1902 has removed some of the inequalities created by the Act of 1870. We shall no longer be called upon to content ourselves with insufficient apparatus and furniture. Our teachers will be adequately remunerated, and will not now have to make the sacrifices so generously and so nobly accepted in the past. We are given a more definitely recognized place in the educational system of the country. We have no longer to appeal to the charity of our people for the daily working of our schools. In other words, the inequality existing between the provided and non-provided schools of to-day is not so great as that which existed between the board schools and the voluntary schools which they have supplanted. But though less in degree, the inequality is the same in character, and it calls loudly for redress.

Only an Instalment of Justice.

3. Some time ago, when the Act of 1902 was under consideration, I ventured to say that it was only an instalment of justice. I repeat that statement to-day, and I say that that Act leaves untouched the fundamental injustice wrought by the Act of 1870. What is the actual position? The people of England are divided into two camps. Those who prefer that their children shall receive at school only secular training or some colourless moral instruction are placed in a position of privilege. Sites are procured, and schools are built for them, without regard to expense; and all this is done at the public cost. Those, however, who regard definite religious teaching as an all-important and fundamental part of education, are called upon to provide at their own expense sites and buildings in order that their children may receive the education which, as a matter of conscience, they require for them. In other words, while both classes alike are composed of those who pay the same rates and taxes, and have the same rights as citizens of the one same country, the upholders of definite religious teaching are placed under a disability, and are, in fact, penalized on account of their conscientious belief.

We have heard a great deal of the Nonconformist conscience, and of the injury done to Nonconformist children because they are obliged to frequent Anglican or other schools. I would gladly do away with every such grievance, where it exists, but I confess that I am astonished to find so little appreciation on the part of our Nonconformist friends of the fact that other

people have consciences too, and that many of them, owing to the Acts of 1870 and 1902, have suffered, and are suffering still, a far greater injustice than any of which Nonconformists have to complain. Until the privileged position accorded to secularists and Nonconformists by the educational legislation begun in 1870 is swept away, there can be no permanent settlement of the Education Question, and the primary education of the country will continue to suffer to the great detriment of the nation. The voluntary schools struggled on for years with an insufficient staff of under-paid teachers, only too often in badly built and ill-equipped schools, and, notwithstanding, they attained results beyond all expectation. But they could not compete with their rivals backed by the public purse, and able to indulge in costly improvements at their whim. The non-provided schools of to-day will do their best with such buildings as their friends can provide, but they cannot compete on equal terms with those who will find schools provided at public cost whenever and wherever they need them. I do not complain of the vast sums expended on school sites and buildings by the public authorities of the land. Education is so important that I welcome everything that will make it more efficient, more attractive, and more accessible. But all these advantages should be the heritage of all alike, and it is unjust that any one should be debarred from them on account of his conscientious beliefs. All should have the same rights in this respect, be they Catholic, Anglican, or Nonconformist.

III.

The Solution: Recognize and Meet the Religious Difficulty.

Where, then, ladies and gentlemen, is the solution of the education difficulty to be found? Some will tell you that we are tending to the complete secularization of all public elementary schools. I trust that this is not the case, for such a policy would not only be a calamity to the nation as a whole, but it would most certainly not be a solution of the difficulty which confronts us. Rather it would intensify still more the crying injustice of which we have already so much reason to complain. The lesson of passive resistance has been taught very prominently of late. But what, I ask you, would its most acute recent developments be in comparison with the resistance, both active and passive, which—if the Christianity of England is worth anything at all—would at once be aroused, if Christian parents were to be forced to send their children to schools which their conscience abhorred? Compulsory education in secularized schools would most certainly not end the difficulty.

To find a solution I go back to the words of Cardinal Manning, written in 1882 :—

> . . . If the Government may tax the whole people for education, *the whole people have a right to share in the beneficial use of such taxation.* An education rate raised from the whole people ought to be returned to the whole people, in a form or in forms of education of which all may partake. If any one form of education can be found, in which

all the people are content to share, let it be adopted ; if no one such form be possible, let there be as many varieties of form as can with reason be admitted. No one form of religious education would satisfy Catholics, Anglicans, Nonconformists, and unbelievers. No form whatsoever of merely secular instruction will satisfy the great majority, who believe that education without religion is impossible. Therefore, if no one form can be found to satisfy all, *many and various forms of education ought to be equally admitted, and equally allowed to stand on the same ground before the law.*

In other words, an equitable solution is to be found not in ignoring, but in recognizing to the full, the religious differences of the country. On this matter we Catholics can speak quite frankly. We are in no way responsible for the religious divisions which unfortunately exist among our fellow-countrymen. None deplore those divisions more than we do. We would heal them if we could, but we recognize them as stubborn facts which must be taken into account in every department of our national administration. With regard to the provision of elementary schools, let all Englishmen alike stand on an equal footing before the law, and let all alike have, under reasonable conditions, schools properly built and fully equipped at the public cost—to which all alike contribute—but of a character to which they can send their children without any injury being done to their conscientious religious convictions. I say *under reasonable conditions*, because where very few children of one religious belief are to be found, it would

admit, I believe, that the Catholic body has endeavoured to co-operate with them loyally, and to abstain from raising difficulties, in the very complex and difficult work of reorganizing the education of the country. They will not take it amiss, therefore, I trust, if, as we are bound to do, we urge most strongly upon their notice any deviation from the understanding arrived at in 1902, or any matter in which educational requirements are enforced to the detriment of our schools. The Education Act of 1902 has lessened the injustice to which all voluntary schools were subjected ; there must be no increase of that injustice in any shape or form.

Lastly, while we toil and strain every nerve to make the best use of the existing situation, while we do all in our power to promote in every way the education of our children and of the nation to which they belong, we must never forget that the Education Question has not received its final solution. While the Acts of 1870 and of 1902 have done much to ensure the due instruction of the people, they have done so by leaving an unfair burden on religious conviction. Until that burden is removed, until all English children are able to receive on equal terms an education in conformity with the conscientious requirements of their parents, the problem remains unsolved. Against the fundamental injustice initiated by the Act of 1870, and continued, though in a mitigated form, by the Act of 1902, we protest as loudly as we can, and our protest must be renewed and repeated until that injustice is finally swept away.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.

THE CATHOLIC ATTITUDE ON THE EDUCATION QUESTION

By the ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER[1]

For thirty-five years the education of our poorer children has been the absorbing preoccupation of the Catholics of this country, and there seems no prospect of arriving, within a measurable space of time, at a solution which will put an end to all controversy and allay all anxiety. There are, indeed, many subjects which are intimately connected with the progress of the Catholic Church in England which might well be treated on the occasion of a great gathering like this, in a large centre of a very important diocese. But, weighing their gravity against that of this question of education, I feel that, without excuse or any seeking for justification, I may again ask the members of the Catholic Truth Society, and the friends who have welcomed them to this town, to give all their attention for a few

[1] Address delivered at Blackburn, Sept. 25, 1905, at the opening of the Catholic Conference.

moments to the aspects of the question which now confront us.

As far as legislation goes, we are as we were just a year ago. A clearer interpretation of the Acts of 1902 and 1903 has been given on some disputed points. Increased powers have been granted to the Board of Education to facilitate the working of those Acts. The opposition to them is less noisy and less virulent, and this in many cases because personal contact and more intimate knowledge have brought a truer and fairer conception of the work carried on in the non-provided schools. Accurate information shows that in very many parts of the country our schools are working under decidedly improved conditions, and that a good understanding prevails between the foundation managers and the local authorities. In some few areas there is bitter and avowed hostility to our schools, showing itself in acts of grave injustice, and, it would appear, of positive illegality. No distinct provision seems to have been made in the Acts to prevent an unjust differentiation between the salaries of teachers; probably because it never entered the mind of any honourable man to suppose that such an attempt would be ever made. The majority of the London County Council, with the support of those who in all other matters make themselves the champions of fair wages, have decreed that our Catholic teachers are to be underpaid, and can assign for their decision only the shallowest and most flimsy of reasons.

Our Attitude in the Future.

What of the future? We are told repeatedly that the present Government is doomed; that before a year is passed a great Liberal majority will be the parliamentary masters of the country; that their first concern will be to amend, or repeal, or manipulate the Education Acts, in such a way as to destroy the Catholic character of our schools. In other words, we are assured that in a few months' time we shall be in presence of a crisis far more serious than any which we have yet had to face. These things may be true, they may be false; probably they contain some exaggeration. But, if it be a fact—and the recent forced retirement of a great soldier, a distinguished Irishman, and an excellent Catholic, Sir William Butler, from the field of political candidature is a most ominous sign—if it be a fact that the great political party now in opposition has definitely committed itself to a policy which means the destruction of what we regard as essential to the Catholic character of our schools, what, then, is to be our attitude?

Our attitude in the future must be true to our attitude in the past. In that phrase we may fairly sum up the whole situation. It is not in our power to initiate policy; it would indeed be a great error on our part to make the necessarily fruitless attempt to do so. We have neither the numbers nor the political strength to warrant any such attempt. We have rather to scrutinize very closely the proposals

of those who sway the political destinies of the country, to whatever party they may belong, and to endeavour to discern the aim and object towards which they are ultimately tending. If these proposals are in accordance with the principles for which we have contended so long, then they deserve all our support. If, however, they are in contradiction to those principles, no effort must be omitted to bring them to nought. We cannot say with absolute accuracy what the future policy of political parties is to be. But we do know, and we ought to be absolutely clear in holding and in enunciating, the principles which have always animated us in the struggles of the past. Standing, therefore, midway between the anxieties which preceded the last efforts of the Legislature, and the fierce battle which very probably soon awaits us; on this, the last occasion on which it may be possible to address a Conference of the Catholic Truth Society before the conflict is actually joined, I desire to recall to you some of the declarations of the last thirty-five years, and to place before you in what may be a useful outline, the great principles which have been our mainstay in the past, and which must, under all circumstances, be the foundation of our policy in the future.

The Declaration of 1870.

The first declaration to which I call your attention is very interesting, as it was prepared in 1870, when the Bishops were absent in Rome, with a view of

conveying to Catholic Members of Parliament the views and wishes of the Catholic laity in reference to Mr. Forster's Bill which had just been introduced. Its main statements are as follows :—

> That no moral training can be efficient unless built on the truths of religion, and therefore the Church is essentially concerned in the most important part of true education, since according to our faith Christ has appointed the Church and its ministers to be the teachers of moral and religious truth.—That by the natural and divine law it is the duty and right of parents to educate their children, and all Christian fathers and mothers are bound to see that their children receive a Christian education.—That it is the duty of the State or civil authority to provide for the good order and well-being of the community and, as these depend principally on the proper education of the individual members of the community, it is the duty of the State and its truest policy to assist parents in the discharge of the aforesaid duty, or to compel them to fulfil it if they neglect to do so.—That the manifold differences in religious convictions which exist in this country render such action on the part of the State a matter of grave practical difficulty, because while on the one hand the general enforcement upon all of any particular system of sectarian teaching would involve most serious violations of the rights of conscience, the establishment on the other of

a system of secular education from which religious teaching should be excluded would be equally opposed to the conscientious convictions of the majority of the people of this country, which are deeply impressed with the importance of the sacred truths of Christianity.—That consequently a system of popular education founded on the secular system, instead of being unsectarian, would be sectarian in the most obnoxious sense to the community generally, and it would be especially unjust to Roman Catholics, who under such a system would be compelled to support schools contrary to the plain dictates of their consciences and to send their children to them, or burthen themselves additionally with the entire cost of maintaining other schools of which their consciences would approve.—That whilst, therefore, the Roman Catholics of Great Britain declare cheerfully their readiness to co-operate in establishing any just system of national education which is necessary to extend to all the benefits of education, they have a right to ask that it may be based on principles which will not do violence to their consciences, and be protected by provisions which will enable them to avail themselves of its benefits, without sacrificing rights and interests the most sacred to themselves and their children.

I need not allude to the article which Cardinal Manning wrote in *The Nineteenth Century* of

December, 1882, for I quoted from it at length last year, and it is no doubt present to your memory.[1]

The Bishops in 1884 and 1885.

The next pronouncement of importance is contained in the resolutions of the Bishops in Low Week, 1884 :—

> The Bishops are of opinion that the time is come when Catholics should make a great and united effort to secure the just rights of Catholic schools, by using every means to set before the public the many grievances inflicted on them by the educational law, and by labouring in every way for the removal of these grievances. All who pay rates and taxes have an equal right to receive educational assistance in proportion to their need, their numbers, and the value of their services.

In 1885 we find the following most important declaration :—

> The sacred rights and liberties of parents and children are invaded and destroyed by any kind of compulsory State education which separates religion from education, or which dictates what shall be the amount and kind of religious instruction which children shall receive during the period of their education. We renew the repeated condemnation pronounced by ourselves

[1] See *The Education Act of* 1902 ; *the Difficulty and its Solution.* Price 1d. Catholic Truth Society.

and by the Church on all systems of mixed education; and we declare that the temporal and eternal interests of Christian youth demand above all things that the mind, heart, and character shall be trained and educated in Christian truths and principles. While we heartily unite in the universal desire that all children shall be suitably educated, we maintain that the State cannot, without violation of the natural and divine law, compel parents to educate their children in a system which is opposed to their conscience and religion; and we declare that the Catholics of this country cannot accept for themselves any system of education which is divorced from their religion.

Inasmuch as in the year 1869 a scheme of education, "universal, secular, compulsory, and free," in the hands of the State, was announced and recommended by parties and by persons of political notoriety, we feel bound in duty to declare that we cannot consent to accept such a scheme, or in any way to aid in substituting a system which is foreign and fatal to Christianity, and to the traditional Christian education of the people of England. We have abstained from entering into many details, but there is one so glaring in its inequality and injustice that we cannot refrain from entering our protest against it, namely, the use of two measures in appraising the value of work done and of instruction given. . . .

Cardinal Manning's "Reasons."

Readers of the *Life of Cardinal Manning* will recollect the impression made on thinking men by his publication in 1888 of "Fifty Reasons why the Voluntary Schools of England ought to share the School Rates." I will give you some of the most striking of those reasons:

1. Because all who pay Rates ought to share in the benefit of the Rates.

2. Because to compel payment and to exclude from participation is political injustice.

3. Because to offer participation upon conditions known beforehand to be of impossible acceptance is wilful and deliberate exclusion.

4. Because to offer education either without Christianity or with indefinite Christianity to the people of England—of whom the great majority are definitely and conscientiously Christian—is a condition known beforehand to be of impossible acceptance. Such offer is therefore politically and morally unjust.

11. Because they (the voluntary schools) are the only safeguard of the rights and conscience both of parents and children.

12. Because they embody the freedom of the people to educate themselves in opposition to the pagan and revolutionary claim that the education of the people is the State.

13. Because the Christian people of England never have given up, never can give up, this

natural and Christian liberty of conscience. The Act of 1870 did not spring from their will, nor does it represent their mind.

14. Because, until Christianity, full and definite, made England to be one and Christian, there was no England. The only England known to history and to the world is Christian England, which has been perpetuated by the Christian conscience of the people until the schools of 1870 departed from the education of their forefathers.

41. Because neither will the denominational system ever win back the whole population of England and Wales, nor will the board school system ever extinguish the Christian schools of this country; but a higher, larger, and equal law, giving place and liberty of action to both the voluntary and board school systems, will reconcile their variances and peacefully mature and complete a National system of education worthy of the name.

45. Because local administration is surest, and develops local responsibility and energy: which are suspended and destroyed by centralisation.

46. Because a large decentralisation of the functions of the Education Department is certain, inevitable, and more expedient.

47. Because what touches so closely the conscience and homes of the people ought to be within their knowledge and reach.

48. Because the education of the children is a local duty, and confers a local benefit. It ought, therefore, to be cared for, and in part paid for by each locality.

Further Declarations by the Bishops.

In 1891 the Bishops resolved that—

It was preferable that the control of elementary education should be transferred to the county councils, and that school boards should be abolished.

Later in the same year they declared that—

It is important both for the present welfare and for the future safety of our schools, that the committees of management be made efficient, and that two persons elected by the parents of the children be added to the three *ex officio* existing managers, and that, as the voluntary system is essentially the education of children under the responsibility of their parents, every possible effort ought to be made in all the dioceses and parishes to awaken parents to a consciousness of their duties and rights ; and that the management of the schools, according to the requirements of the law as it now exists, should be vigorously and efficiently carried out.

In 1893 the Bishops pronounced as follows :—

1. That in accordance with natural law, the management of public elementary schools ought to be in the hands of persons having the

confidence of the parents of the children frequenting such schools.

2. That consequently the denominational system of education must be maintained and strengthened by all means in our power.

3. That, towards providing the cost of improved secular instruction, Catholic public elementary schools have a right to a fair share of the rates; and that the ratepayers have a corresponding right to such inspection and oversight as shall ensure a proper expenditure of their contribution towards the cost of public education.

The Declaration of 1894.

In 1894 the Bishops again discussed the matter at length, and their resolutions were as follows :—

1. That it is a right and a duty, given to parents by their Creator, wherever such natural right has not been forfeited, to secure and watch over the education of their children in that which they believe to be the true religion.

2. That no plea on behalf of educational uniformity, and no decision by any majority of votes, can alter or abrogate this fundamental natural law, which the Legislature and the people of this country are equally bound to respect and observe.

3. That, in the nature of things, it can never tend to the happiness, the welfare, or the permanent advantage of a State, to disregard, and

in practice to outrage, a law of nature, such as the right of parents over the education of their children, be the injury brought about directly, or indirectly, by a process of law, or by a process of privation and exhaustion.

4. That, while political power and the responsibilities of self-government are more and more devolving upon the masses of the people, and while obvious dangers menace the future of Society, it is to the country's highest advantage that religious principles of life and conduct should be deepened and strengthened in the souls of all during the period of elementary education; and that these advantages can be adequately secured, so far as the education of Catholics is concerned, only by Catholic public elementary schools, conducted under Catholic management.

5. That Catholic parents cannot in conscience accept or approve for their children a system of education in which secular instruction is wholly divorced from education in their religion.

6. That Catholic parents cannot in conscience accept or approve for their children a system of religious education based upon private interpretations of the Bible given by school teachers, whether trained in religious knowledge or untrained.

7. That the only system of religious education which Catholic parents can accept for their children is that given under the authority and

direction of the Catholic Church, which they believe that Christ Himself has appointed to teach all those things which He has revealed.

8. That to take the management of schools intended for Catholic children out of the hands of those who represent the religious convictions of their parents, and to place it in the hands of public ratepayers who cannot represent those convictions, is a violation of parental rights, to be resisted as an unwarrantable attack upon religious liberty and upon a fundamental law of nature.

9. That Catholic public elementary schools, satisfying the demands of the Education Department, have a right to as full a share of public money, whether from the rates or from the taxes, as any other public elementary schools in the country; and that it is unjust to deprive them of it because of the religious instruction required by the parents, which is given to the children attending such schools.

11. That compulsory State education is an intolerable tyranny, unless due regard be paid by the State to the education of the children in their own religion; that happily, in the case of pauper and semi-criminal children, such regard is part of the English Law, which makes provision for the education of such children in their own faith; and that, therefore, consistency and justice require that the children of the honest working classes, who are compelled

under penalties to attend school, should not be less advantageously provided for in respect to education in their own religion.

12. That the *doctrinaire* assumption, presented to the people as axiomatic, viz., that a contribution from the rates to a school invests the ratepayers with a right, never claimed on behalf of taxpayers, to supersede the natural responsibility of control invested in the parents, is preposterous, unjust, and contrary to fact.

Demand for Equal Treatment, 1895.

In 1895, we find the following :—

The justice of the claim put forward in the Draft Bill, adopted unanimously by the Catholic Archbishop and Bishops in January last, ought to be more and more urgently pressed home upon the minds of the electorate of the country, and upon statesmen and politicians. No effort should be spared to convince the English people that the public elementary schools, used by parents determined that the secular education should be associated with definite religious training, cannot be thrown upon private charity (and thus be placed at a fatal disadvantage with board schools) without a flagrant injustice, and without national reproach and dishonour in a Christian country like England. The electorate must be persuaded and convinced—that all denominational schools, faithfully complying

with the requirements of the Education Department have a right to receive an equal proportionate share with board schools of all public moneys, whether paid from the rates or the taxes, for educational purposes; and that liberty should be granted to open new denominational schools wherever required by a sufficient number of parents and children.

Declaration in view of the Bill of 1902.

In November, 1901, in view of approaching legislation, the Bishops issued a statement of the Catholic claim, from which we extract the following sentences :—

I. They take it for granted that the payment of public moneys, whether derived from the rates or the taxes, will be made equitably to the maintenance of all schools fufilling the educational conditions, irrespective of creed.

II. They consider it essential that there should be placed on the Education Committee of the County Council representatives of the great educational interests that have grown up with the Education Department.

It must be borne in mind that the Education Committee of the County Council will be the educational citadel of each county. If that citadel do not contain chosen representatives of the great Christian educational bodies, these bodies will be constrained from the first to take

up an attitude of well-founded fear and suspicion. They will perceive that the lead of the Government, ignoring their claim even to a minimum of official representation on the Education Committees, may easily be improved upon to their serious and permanent disadvantage. They will understand how, in the absence of official representation, public opinion may by degrees be formed and strengthened in the county councils against the interests of definite Christian education. Thus the refusal to admit any official representation of the religious or voluntary schools upon the education committees will inevitably lead to the introduction into the county council elections of politico-religious animosities and contests, which will be followed by their natural consequences. Whereas, if the constitutional precedent be followed, which recognizes the claim of religion to be represented in the Imperial Legislature, evidence will be given of a sincere desire to maintain that equilibrium of forces which is essential to the peaceful and progressive development of a national system of education.

III. The Bishops consider it essential to the natural growth of Christian schools throughout the country, that the clause in the Scotch Education Act of 1872, Section 67, which recognizes the increase of such schools, regard being had to the religious belief of the parents, should be introduced into the English Bill.

IV. They hold that it is an essential condition to the existence of their schools that the managers should retain in their hands the right of appointment and dismissal of teachers ; while at the same time public bodies responsible for public money may naturally claim a representation on the school management for sanitary, financial, and scholastic purposes, in a proportion not exceeding one in three.

I need not make any reference to the more recent declarations, for they are in all likelihood very well known to you.

From these various declarations three principles stand clearly forth.

Parental Right and Duty.

1. It is a duty of Christian parents to bring up their children in the Christian faith ; in other words, while preparing them to take their place in life, to fit them at the same time for the kingdom of their Father who is in heaven. They are bound to see that they are educated and trained in the practice of religion. If they attend to all else and neglect this, then do they fail in the most important part of their parental duty. Circumstances are such at the present day that many parents are unable from want of time or lack of capacity, and too often from neglect and indifference, to provide adequately for the education of their children. And, as the consequences of this inability or neglect would be the

most serious to the common weal, the State rightly intervenes, and makes every effort to assist and guide parents in the discharge of these primary duties, and to supply for all those things in which they are in default. To effect this, the State is entitled to resort to compulsion, and to levy rates and taxes, thus obliging the whole community without exception to bear the burden which belongs to the individuals that compose it. But the State does not thereby supersede the parent, or destroy the rights and duties which belong to parents, but assuming the responsibility which those rights and duties carry with them, is bound to discharge that responsibility without infringing the rights and duties which are its very source. In arranging any system of national and compulsory education the conscientious convictions of parents must never be overlooked, and any system which violates them is fundamentally unjust. The application of this principle is without doubt surrounded by many difficulties in a country like England, and Catholics have never shown themselves unwilling to consider and accept any fair solution. But we can never insist too strongly on the fact that the policy followed for the last thirty-five years of giving an exceptionally favoured and privileged position to those who attach no importance to definite religious teaching in elementary schools, is essentially unfair, and has retarded most seriously the educational progress of the country. It is, moreover, a violation of the rights of many parents and a wrongful use of money

contributed by the ratepayers independently of their religious creed.

The Right of All to Acceptable Education.

2. Our first concern is for our own Catholic children. Their parents and their pastors must ever give them the first place in their thoughts, and be prepared to make every sacrifice and every exertion to secure for them a Christian education. But we should be false to the principles which our leaders have enunciated so often in the past, untrue to our name of Christians and Catholics, were we in the concern about our own, to forget altogether and disregard the thousands of parents who, although they have not the Catholic faith, are keenly and earnestly solicitous that their children should be brought up at school in the knowledge and fear of God, and receive therein a definite religious training. It matters not by what name they are called—be they Anglicans, or Wesleyans, or belonging to any other denomination—we cannot be indifferent to the zeal and earnestness and self-sacrifice which so many of them have shown in their endeavours to secure and maintain a religious training for their children.

It has sometimes been said, generally by those who are opposed to us, that there has been an alliance on this question between Catholics and the members of the Established Church, and that our cause has been injured thereby. I believe this statement to be without foundation. I know of

no understanding either in the past or in the present which, with any propriety of language, could be designated an alliance. But it is undoubtedly true that many who are Anglicans, and many who are not, are led by the same principle of parental right which has guided us, and are striving after the same end, namely, the maintenance of definite religion in public elementary schools, and I trust that we shall never look with indifference, still less with coldness, on the efforts which they are making. Working as they are on lines parallel to those which we have laid down for ourselves, they deserve our sympathy and encouragement. We know the admiration with which many of them in their turn regard the hard struggle which we have had to make for our schools against odds far greater than those with which they themselves have usually had to contend. Lamenting as we do the divisions into which the Christianity of England has been torn since it was severed from the centre of unity, the Apostolic See, we can never, without failing in the duty of honour and of conscience which, precisely as Catholics, we owe to the nation as a whole, be indifferent to the efforts of those who are convinced of the vital importance of maintaining definite religious influences in the minds and hearts of all the children of England, even though we see that those influences are only partial and inadequate for their task. What we ask for ourselves we ask for all those who claim it on the same grounds. Our demand is that all Christian parents should have it

in their power to find in the elementary schools of the country an education in conformity with their conscientious convictions, without let or hindrance or disability of any kind ; and that the privileges now conferred on those who attach no importance to definite religious teaching should be finally abolished.

Fidelity to Principles.

3. Even if all others abandon the principles for which we stand, we can never relinquish them. I trust that the day will never come when those to whom I have just alluded will declare themselves indifferent to the maintenance of their schools, or will content themselves with some vague and shadowy "right of entry." I do not think that such a day is near, but should it ever come, and should all others fall away from the principles which have animated us so long, we must stand firm, even though we stand alone. Then, and not till then, may we fairly claim separate treatment, for others will have definitely separated themselves from us. Until then, such an idea is a mere will-o'-the-wisp, alluring us from the real and present work which demands all our attention. We ask for no privilege, and at the present time separate treatment would be a privilege, arousing ultimately against us all the animosity which privileges engender. In the contingency—far off, I hope—which I have foreshadowed, separate treatment would be no privilege at all, but the only possible recognition of the rights which we have

unceasingly and unflinchingly claimed. Till that moment comes, I trust that we shall not hear anything of such a solution of our difficulties.

Conclusion.

Looking back, as I have lately been obliged to do, over the whole educational period since 1870, I find much to encourage and to strengthen us. There have been very dark moments, but they have passed and given place to comparative peace. Then the struggle has been renewed, and new fears have been awakened and fresh efforts have been needed. And meanwhile the work of the Church has advanced, and our bishops and clergy and faithful have been generous and united in the presence of each fresh difficulty. One conclusion forces itself upon my mind, that we are making a great mistake in attributing to the Acts of 1902 and 1903 the special difficulties which some of us feel so very keenly at the present moment. The causes are much further back, and those Acts are the inevitable results of causes already for a long time at work, causes which we cannot control, but the effects of which we shall feel more and more as time goes on, and which bring with them difficulties of a new order which we must face with courage and strive to overcome. The whole education of the country is undergoing change. It has entailed fresh outlay, more co-ordination, increased local control. These things had to come, and in the resetting it was inevitable, as it was in 1870, that we should pass through a time of stress

and toil. That time is not over, but with the experience of the past and our knowledge of the strength of our cause, and above all with the assistance of God, we may surely hope that we shall come forth with our position strengthened and consolidated. Unity of action is of extreme importance. It is not wise to put forth unauthorized programmes of unattainable perfection. It is neither wise, nor is it just, to impute to those who look with scant interest on such efforts, pusillanimity or a dangerous tendency to compromise, because they are obliged to look facts in the face, and are, perhaps, in closer touch with the men with whom decisions must ultimately rest. Our only hope, apart from supernatural aid, lies in quietly and courteously and firmly making known our convictions to our fellow-countrymen, and gradually bringing them to see in what light these matters appear to us. Heated language, violent discussion, polemical bitterness have not served us in the past; they are not serving us in the administration of the recent Acts; they will certainly not help us in the future.

But we have our principles to sustain us, and the history of the past to encourage us; and we are determined to continue the struggle, which was begun long before most of us could have any share in it, and which will probably be still waging in one form or another long after the things of this world have ceased to be of any concern to us.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.

THE MAINTENANCE OF RELIGION IN THE SCHOOL[1]

By the ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER

Religion is a vital element in every civilized country, an essential factor in constituting a nation in that ordered well-being which every people desires to attain. And this is true even when men are not in agreement as to the precise forms which are to express their dependence upon their Maker, and when they view their relation to Him not all in the same way. Weaken the power of religion, and you relax the bonds which knit a civilized people together. Destroy and uproot religion, and you will have to encounter the wildest forces of human passion, and you will be beaten in the encounter. And the result will be the same whether you deliberately aim at the destruction of religion, or allow it, without your knowledge or intention, to grow languid and eventually to die away.

In this country we pride ourselves, unduly in the estimate of our neighbours, upon our religious and God-fearing spirit. We point to the respect in which the Word

[1] The Inaugural Address delivered at the Catholic Conference at Preston, September 9, 1907.

of God has been held; we are loudly conscious of the purity of our home life and of the right observance of the Lord's day; and, in a spirit of which the Gospel has spoken in terms which are not those of commendation, we thank God that we are not as other nations, breakers of the Sabbath and heedless of family ties. Too close inquiry into the grounds upon which our self-complacency rests might lead to a very painful realization of the gulf which may easily yawn between pleasing theories and actual practice. There is for my present purpose no object in undertaking such an investigation. We will take the average Englishman at his own estimate, and give credit to our country for all the virtues and super-excellent qualities that he claims for it. The more precious its gifts the greater is the danger which threatens the national life from the forces which are attacking religion at its foundation in the very heart of the people.

The Ultimate Issue.

It is time, I think, to leave for a moment the engrossing, but still comparatively petty, details which are absorbing our thoughts in the great struggle for educational freedom in England. These details compel our attention, but if they are dwelt upon exclusively they obscure the ultimate issue, and may lead us to forget that in fighting for the existence of our Catholic schools we are also and necessarily withstanding those agencies which, unconsciously or wilfully, are working for the destruction of all religion in the country. For if the taskmasters that govern our present Parliamentary rulers have their way, the religion of the nation will receive a blow from which it can, humanly speaking, never recover.

There are two main ideals for the religious life of a

country. There is the old notion, consecrated by the practice and experience of so many centuries, that, as there can be but one Christian faith, delivered to us wholly and fully by Christ Himself, so there should be but one worship and one religion, the natural outcome of that faith. It is that notion, familiar to us all, which explains the action of the Catholic Church in every age, namely, that there is but one Lord, one Faith, and one Baptism. And so when the authority of the Church was universally recognized, every child born into a Christian nation received as an inheritance transmitted by his parents a knowledge of the way in which God would be worshipped and his own salvation could be attained. The religious difficulty in the school had, and could have, no existence. Parents might indeed neglect their duty, and children might be allowed to grow up in ignorance of God's teaching, but all were agreed as to the form of that teaching and the place where it was to be found. There was one faith, one religion, and one school to teach them both. Regretfully we acknowledge that that ideal has passed away. Its destruction has not been the work of the Catholic Church, which has never ceased to uphold it, and which lives with the prayerful hope that it may one day be realized again.

In place of this single teaching we now find a denial of any absolute certainty in matters of religious belief, and men band themselves together, with or without the oversight and control of the civil Government, to worship God according to the views which they have conceived concerning their relations to their Maker. There is no longer one faith; religion has put on many varied forms; there can be no longer only one school, seeing that the teaching of these things no longer possesses the unity of days gone by. And men have come to understand that, just as of old

there could be but one teaching of fundamental truths, because no one could dream of any other doctrine; so in the present divergence of opinions, schools of various types have to be admitted to allow parents to bring up their children in the doctrines which, in the exercise of their individual responsibility, they have adopted for themselves. The new ideal, then, has been that, as men were no longer agreed about the forms of religion, latitude must be given to teach children these different forms, lest all religion perish from their hearts.

The Establishment of Undenominationalism.

But we have now to face a very different system, and one which, in its own nature, is singularly arrogant, aggressive, and unjust. It professes to be much concerned about the religion of the country, and most apprehensive lest a day should come when all religious teaching shall be banished from the elementary schools of the land. While proclaiming its hatred of all dogmatizing, it arrogates to itself the right of declaring that there is a form of teaching, so vague, so colourless, so simple, that it may be taught in every school without wounding the conscience of any learner; and that, in spite of its indefiniteness and nebulosity, such teaching will be enough to maintain the religious character of the nation: for the upholders of the system of which I speak are perfectly aware that for vast numbers of the children there can be no religious teaching of any kind except that which they receive while they are at the school desk. And so enamoured are they of their own invention that they propose to arm it with all the power of the public purse, and to deny this tremendous assistance to any teaching but that of which they themselves approve. Truly never has

there been injustice more shameless and more arrogant than this.

I know full well that among those who are forcing this so-called undenominational teaching upon the elementary schools of the country there are many men of high principle, of deep religious feeling, and of undoubted kindliness of heart, and that they would be deeply concerned were they to see that, in reality, they are striking a deadly blow at the religious life of the country. It is to them that I would appeal, and I beg them to reflect very carefully and impartially whether they may not be making a very grave miscalculation, while imagining that they have found the solution of a very serious difficulty. I make no plea now for our Catholic schools in particular, although they do possess special rights to kindly consideration; but I plead for just consideration of various forms of religious teaching in our schools, lest the religious influences in the nation, already so much weakened, prove powerless to stem the torrents of evil which assail us. Pleasure, self-interest, self-advancement are breaking down the moral law to an extent which must appal all those who are in a position to mark their ravages. The civil law can do but little to withstand them, and not infrequently throws down itself some of the barriers which the religion and conscience of other ages had erected. After hundreds of years of Christianity we find ourselves obliged, year after year, to pass many statutes to regulate matters which the Christian conscience no longer suffices to control. This certainly is no moment to weaken still more those restraints which rest for their foundation upon religion, and such weakening is the evident result of that Nonconformist solution of the Education question which his Majesty's Government would fain force upon us. They manifest

horror at the idea of a godless school, of a school where the name of God may not be mentioned. Will, I make bold to ask, the ideal public elementary school conceived in the Act of 1870, and fostered by every Government since then—and now, by the starvation of other schools, to be made paramount and supreme—prove of much greater efficiency as a teacher of moral integrity than the "*École sans Dieu*," at which the phariseeism of England stands aghast?

Its Insufficiency.

In answering this question I can speak with certainty only in so far as our own people are concerned. With regard to others I speak under the correction of those who have more knowledge. But my own conviction is that in every case the undenominational school will have little more efficacy in inculcating moral rectitude than a school whence religious teaching has been excluded, though the absence of real religion may therein be concealed under the outward appearance of the few moments devoted to indefinite religious exercises. Children need very simple teaching, it is true; but they need, still more, teaching which is clear and definite and based on facts. The instruction which a Christian child receives in a good Christian home is simplicity itself, but it is so distinct and definite that it remains clearly imprinted upon his memory, and is quickly present in his mind to guide his will and to direct his conduct. Simplicity and indefiniteness are not correlative terms, and I have no belief in the moral efficacy of indefinite teaching, which hesitates to speak in plain terms of God and our relation to Him, of the Fall and of the Redemption, of heaven and of hell, of the means of avoiding sin and of living in God's friend-

ship, and of all the other fundamental truths which have been made known to us. That this simple teaching is inadequate, as I assert it to be, is shown by the admission of every earnest Nonconformist that the Sunday school is absolutely necessary in order to complete the religious teaching imparted in the elementary school. But how many children are there to be found on the registers of Sunday schools, how few comparatively are in actual attendance, and how vast already is the number of those whose only contact with religion is the indefinite lesson allowed by the Cowper-Temple Clause. If our opponents have their way in starving the Non-provided Schools to extinction, this army of little children, whose souls mutely cry out to know the God who made them, will be immeasurably recruited.

The Limitations of Undenominational Teachers.

Moreover, the teacher in the Provided School, well trained and able though he may be, cannot claim absolute confidence either as an imparter of religious knowledge or as the moulder of character on religious lines. It is no answer whatever to this criticism to point to the good results said to have been attained in the past in the Board Schools, for until recently, as Nonconformists bitterly complain, the majority of teachers had been trained in colleges under very definite religious teaching, as hardly any one seems to have thought it necessary to be at the expense of establishing a really undenominational training college. Some two years ago a dignitary of the Established Church, speaking of the London area, stated that he and many others would be quite content with a settlement of the Education question on the lines of "a right of entry" to all Provided Schools, because in every one of them could be found Anglican

teachers, trained under Anglican auspices, willing and competent to impart the definite teaching of their Church. But, in future, indefinite teaching is to be imparted by those who have not necessarily had any definite teaching themselves; whose belief or unbelief can never be called in question; and who, notwithstanding this, will have and must have that potent influence over the character of the children committed to their care which rightly belongs to every one who holds the sacred office of a teacher, standing for the time being in the place of the parents themselves. For elementary teachers are henceforth to be assimilated to civil servants, as though there were any logical parity between the two careers beyond the fact that they are both paid for from the same purse. A civil servant has a most honourable position in which he is called upon to discharge certain duties to the State, and in fulfilling them he must be upright, conscientious, and honest. But he has nothing whatever to do with the formation of the character of children. No one, save those of his own family, will look to him for guidance in moral conduct, or seek the inspiration of his life at his lips. Whereas in the case of the teacher, thousands of little children will be largely dependent upon his character, upon his ideals, upon the beliefs and unbeliefs and misbeliefs which unconsciously or consciously give colour and meaning to his actions, for the directing of their own lives and the mapping out of their future ethical careers. Never was analogy more absolutely false than that which is so glibly drawn between the position of an elementary teacher and that of the civil servant. And it is surely a mockery to exalt, as it is but just to do, the dignity, the responsibility, and the far-reaching influence of the schoolmaster, and then to

declare that he may in conscience regard himself merely as a civil servant with no further responsibilities, and that all will in future regard him as such, for the sole reason that he is paid from the public purse. Moral teaching at such hands will in the end mean the death of vital religion in the hearts of all those little children who receive no other training save that of the elementary school, and they may easily come to constitute the majority of the child population of the nation. It is an outlook that no earnest man can contemplate without terrible forebodings. Vague moral training will be powerless against the tremendous forces of human interests and the lust of human passions. Mere intellectual training without reference to the Christian code of conduct will help a man to deceive and outwit his fellows with greater probabilities of success: it will not check the various forms of dishonesty and over-reaching of which all men know, but which the law is almost powerless to control.

The Position as regards Catholics.

In the case of our own Catholic children we have experience of the sad results which attend their inability to find definite Catholic teaching. Catholics they may cease to be, Protestants they will never become, and they drift away to swell the ranks of those who are entirely indifferent to all religious teaching. The position as regards ourselves may be broadly stated as follows:

First, where a Catholic child has a good Catholic home with parents of sufficient knowledge and leisure to watch closely over his religious education, guiding him by both precept and example, he may spend the hours of the school day in a school where no religion is taught, and he will suffer little or no harm, for his home is of such a character

as to be able to do the essential work of a Christian family. Such a child may lack the detailed knowledge of his Faith which a good Catholic school would impart, but he will have the necessary knowledge. In the present rush and stress and material absorption of life, there are few homes that can thus accomplish their whole duty; and it is, therefore, only in exceptional cases that a Catholic child may with any safety lose the advantage of the training given in a Catholic school. The State, moreover, has led parents to expect the school to supply the place of home in almost every detail of education.

Next, those children whose parents are lacking either in the knowledge, or in the leisure, or in the will, to superintend their education in religious matters, stand in manifest need of a school which is Catholic in the full sense of the word, if they are to grow up faithful to the guidance and practice of religion. Without such a school vast numbers will inevitably fall away from the faith of their parents; they will become irreligious and a menace to the society in which they live, for the only control which they can reasonably recognize, outside the menace of the law, will have been fatally obliterated from their consciences. We have the experience of a generation of *lay* teaching in France, and we know the terrible results of robbing a Christian people of its hereditary faith. The work of destruction is rudely and easily done; the ruins remain to show what once existed; the long-promised new edifice of civic moral teaching is not yet in sight; and meanwhile the youth of both sexes are astounding the onlookers by the logical cynicism of their crimes and by their immorality and unbelief. The religious devastation of Italy is not yet so complete as that of its northern neighbour, but the evidence there is clearly to the same effect. Root the

Catholic faith out of the heart of those to whom it has come as the inheritance of many ages, and they will cease to believe in God or master. Socialism, anarchy, and political murders are the natural retribution of those who deny religious teaching to the little child.

The Result of the Withdrawal of State Aid.

Lastly, in the present condition of the Catholic Church in this country, public elementary schools for Catholic children cannot exist without the financial assistance of the State. Toil as we may, deny ourselves to the full extent of our power, and except in a few favoured localities it will be impossible for us to maintain our schools in efficiency, and in most cases even in existence, if the aid of the Public Treasury be denied to us. Probably did the Established Church, with all the wealth belonging to it, determine to keep its schools, even were State aid withdrawn, it might succeed in the attempt, though past experience affords little hope that the heroic endeavour would be ever made. In our case no energy, no heroism, could suffice, and the withdrawal of the subsidies given to our schools would mean their ultimate extinction and the eventual destruction of religion among many thousands of our people. I cannot believe that this is what the bulk of well-meaning, upright Nonconformists really want. Some few there are, no doubt, who, in their fanatic hatred, would rejoice at the overthrow of Catholic influence, even though it should culminate in disbelief and anarchy. But I feel that I should be wronging the great majority were I to impute any such sinister motives to them. But in very truth, is not the result of which I speak the logical and inevitable outcome of the attitude which they have assumed in regard to us, and

towards all definite religious teaching in the elementary schools of England? And I am but stating the barest truth when I declare that if the forces of religion are gradually sapped in the hearts of English children, the blame will lie with those who are pursuing the course to which the great Nonconformist leaders have given their constant and loud-spoken support.

For thirty-seven years the religious schools of England have been checked and hampered and hindered by the unequal conditions imposed upon them. Every effort made for their relief has been denounced and opposed. Last year legislation was introduced which would have destroyed large numbers of such schools. This year it was proposed to make definite religious teaching a reason for financial disability or fine. We are threatened with renewed contests and fresh injustices in the next session of Parliament. Is there to be no end to these inglorious attempts? May we not say to those who oppose us, If you care nothing for our Catholic schools, and attach no importance whatever to our conscientious outcry, still, for the sake of England, for the sake of her vital religious life, will you not stay your hands? Is it not time that you should call a truce?

An Appeal to the Government and the Country.

Our claim is very simple, and in principle we can never recede from it. All who contribute to the public funds, whether as ratepayers or as taxpayers, have a right to equal consideration, and we shall never cease to maintain that all are entitled to the same treatment in school legislation, be they content with undenominational teaching or do they conscientiously regard it as insufficient. Any differentiation is unjust, and we shall unceasingly renew our protest

against it. But we have already shown that in practice we are prepared to exert ourselves to the uttermost to provide and to maintain schools for our Catholic children, even though the State treat us unjustly, as it has done so long, and take advantage of our willingness in order to relieve itself of expense which ought to fall upon the public funds. But as there is a limit to our power, so there must be also to our willingness, and that limit was nearly reached before the legislation of 1902. We need on conscientious grounds Catholic schools with Catholic teachers under efficient Catholic oversight and supervision, and if at any time the legislature enforces such conditions of financial help that the gap between State aid—in whatever form it may be allotted—and the actual expense of the upkeep of our schools in due efficiency, both as to equipment and to the adequate remuneration of our teachers, can no longer be bridged by our own efforts owing to our poverty, then at once we pass from a region of mere injustice into that of open and flagrant religious persecution. Under such circumstances the Government will as surely perpetrate the ruin of our schools as if they were to pass the anti-Christian laws whereby a godless State has wrecked the Catholic schools of France. Against the possibility of such a catastrophe I raise my voice in most earnest appeal to his Majesty's Ministers, that they take heed and realize the possibilities to which they are being hurried by those who claim to be their most devoted and enthusiastic supporters. I appeal to all men of just and upright and Christian mind to endeavour to understand the real issue. It is too late to put us off with platitudes about the popular will and parliamentary mandates and no tests for teachers. These disguises have served their purpose. The reality behind is naked persecution of men who love their faith,

and who desire to bring up their children under its sacred influence, and who will be debarred therefrom by their poverty and the callous indifference of the State. Are the Nonconformists of England in this twentieth century prepared to be branded with this hateful name of persecutors? For it is that title and no other that history will give them, if they remain true to the spirit which has inspired the educational legislation of the last two years. Can we not rise above all this political turmoil and look only to the solid welfare of the nation, which will most certainly be imperilled if the religious teaching of its children is thwarted and obstructed by the action of the State?

The Duty of Catholics.

Our duties are very plain. In season and out of season we must strive to make our position clearer to our fellow-countrymen: force them to see the reasonableness of our contention and the unswerving earnestness and tenacity with which we cling to it. There are many who are against us from sheer ignorance, and the dissipation of that ignorance would promptly lead them to change their attitude towards our educational demands. But there are some whose conversion is beyond all human hopes, and these we must fight with every legitimate weapon, and bring them to see that, small in numbers though we may be, in this matter we speak with one voice and act as one man. Set on foot your Catholic Federations, attend to the registration of your voters. Let no one stand aloof from the organizations, already formed, on any ground of political difference or social distinction. In every mission of the land bring forcibly before the minds of those who claim to speak in the public name, that Catholics will not be silent under injustice, and that, while they are prepared to con-

tinue to make sacrifices for the education of their children, there must be a limit to the burden imposed upon them, and that the persecution which has been in contemplation will recoil upon those who create it. For months we have fought a long and tedious and harassing and ever-changing battle. The blessing of God has protected us so far. And if there be even a harder fight before us in the months to come, with that same Divine blessing and help we will be victorious still.

Eucharistic Congress in 1908.

In the midst of this sad outlook upon the future God gives us consolation, and I am glad to be able to end my words with an announcement full of inspiriting hope to those who do not forget that the Church is the supernatural work of our Divine Lord and Master, and that He is ever in our midst in all our anxieties and sad forebodings. A month ago I was privileged to assist at the great Eucharistic Congress held, for the first time on German soil, in the ancient city of Metz. During that great public testimony to Catholic faith in the Incarnation and its central resultant Mystery, the wish, often expressed before, was constantly reiterated, that the Congress should be held next year in the heart of the British Empire, in the cathedral and city of Westminster. I feel that such a gathering, attended as it would doubtless be by many bishops, priests, and faithful, not only from England but from beyond our shores, would mean much to the building up of the Church in this country; and it would strengthen and deepen the faith of our people, and thereby contribute greatly to that restoration of all things in Christ for which our Holy Father, in the midst of his terrible sorrows and anxieties, so ardently labours and longs. But the due

ordering of so important a Congress can only be assured by the willing co-operation of many individuals and of many different organizations. That I may be justified, therefore, in inviting the permanent Committee of the Congress to hold their next meeting in London in the September of the coming year, I must be able to count with certainty on the united help of all the Catholics of England. There are none to whom I can appeal with greater assurance of prompt and valuable aid than to the members of the Catholic Truth Society, and I now ask them to aid by their prayers, by their presence, and by all other means of which they can dispose, the International Eucharistic Congress which, in all likelihood, will in 1908 honour the Catholic Church in England by meeting in the capital of this great empire. The thought of the blessing which this solemn homage to the Adorable Mystery of our Altars will bring down upon us will give us heart in the coming struggle on behalf of our children, and will insensibly lead us to turn our thoughts continually to Him, from whom alone our final and lasting victory can come.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON U



CATHOLIC EDUCATION AND THE DUTIES OF PARENTS

By the BISHOP OF CLIFTON

Amid the warfare which still rages around education, and which seems to so many to threaten to end in the extinction of the religious character and of the very existence of our Catholic schools, your thoughts have doubtlessly reverted often to those principles, which, as Catholics, you loyally maintain. We are not yet face to face with a decision of this burning question. We have, it may be, little power to bring to bear upon the framing of any decision. But we do well to place in ever clearer light before ourselves and before others what those principles are, by which our verdict upon any decision will have to be formed, and according to which our action may have to be shaped, in case a counter-policy be required of us.

The following doctrine was authoritatively condemned, amongst other errors, by the Supreme Pontiff, Pius IX: "If episcopal seminaries be in some measure excepted, the entire direction of public schools, wherein the youth of a Christian

commonwealth are educated, can and ought to be made over to the Civil Power; and this direction ought so entirely to be put into the hands of the Civil Power, that in no other authority whatsoever be recognized any right of interference in the teaching of the schools, in the course of studies, in the conferring of degrees, in the choice or approval of teachers."[1]

This proposition was justly condemned because it assails the rights of the learned in the community, the rights of the Pastors of the Church, and the rights of parents.

Liberty consists in the unfettered use of one's own rights, connatural or acquired. All such rights are anterior to all State-made laws, since the individual and the family came into existence before the State. By entering into society under a particular form of government, men surrender none of these rights to the State, but merely entrust the State with the protection of their rights, allowing it to dispose not of the substance and real value of their rights but of their exercise and mutual adjustment. If the State offend no pre-existing rights, but confine its action to safeguarding their enjoyment from interference, if it see that no right be distrained without equivalent compensation, its laws are just, and the people whom it governs are free. But if the Civil Power claim to be superior to those rights which existed before it, and which it was called into being to protect, if it lay a giant hand on them, and act as though it were their source and owner, its laws are unjust and its subjects slaves.

[1] Allocutions of November 1, 1850, and September 5, 1851.

All who possess the requisite knowledge, who teach naught but what is true and right and good, and who infringe upon no teaching rights already vested in others, have the right to seek for pupils and to teach: since every one has the right to the good use of his own powers according to existing opportunity. This right to teach was a right confiscated by the French Revolution. We do not say that the State has no rights at all in the matter of education. It has its rights, but within its own sphere. Civil society was not called into being to promote any undertaking of special utility, but to safeguard the rights of all. Hence a Government outsteps its province when it sets itself in competition with individuals or with associations engaged in such undertakings, even though these redound to the common good. Much more does it run counter to its institution, when it forbids such associations, and creates a monopoly for itself. Herein lies one of the injustices of the French Government at the present moment in the matter of education. The State may lay down what is that proficiency in education which it requires for admission to public service. It may impartially support individual and united educational effort. It may educate when parents cannot or will not. But it cannot create its own monopoly of education, or, if it do so, it can only escape the charge of tyranny by guaranteeing to their full worth all pre-existing rights in education.

That the Pastors of the Church have the right to a weighty and a leading voice in the daily education of the little ones of their flock in school may not be granted by all, but must be manifest to all of us who

recognize that it is the whole child that is to be educated there, no less than in the Church and in the home, in order that he may play a noble and a brave part on the stage of this world, and may attain to his highest destinies in the next. None can call in question that good citizenship, as well as the private and domestic virtues, are the fruit of the proper cultivation of the will. They appertain to the domain of conscience and of morals, and to teach morality apart from religion is to build upon a foundation of sand. This truth is recognized both in the Catholic Church and outside it. What causes one's wonder is that there should be found pastors of any Christian body, presumably believing in their commission to teach, yet willing to hand over that commission inside the school to the State. Parliament may be doing its best to be religiously impartial and impartially religious when it proposes to dilute Christianity down to the taste of the weakest of palates; but even children will fail to see any divine credentials in Parliament. To do away with denominationalism in the schools by eliminating dogmatic teaching from them is but to set up one dogma in place of another. Denominational religion teaches the dogma of *yes;* undenominationalism teaches the dogma of *no.* The so called simple Bible teaching, which has been proposed as the maximum of school religion, is such as may be found outside the Bible. Confucius and Seneca taught it, and taught it pretty well. Harmless to many, and good, perhaps, as far as it goes, it would in course of time be in all likelihood dropped, and the experience of America

would be the experience of England. "Dogmatic, that is, denominational teaching, was given up to appease sectarian animosities, and Bible reading substituted; that has been quietly dropped by degrees, and the foundations of Western morality have, in effect, disappeared from the public schools."[1] To this same cause, the elimination of religion from the schools, thoughtful and experienced Americans are now disposed to trace "the corruption in public life, the growth of lawlessness, violence, and juvenile crime, the increasing prevalence of divorce, the taste for foolish, false, and degrading literature, for immoral and unwholesome amusements, the want of reverence, and the failure of the Churches."[2] Such has been there the final outcome of the political parrot-cry, "The Bible inside the school, and the priest outside it!"

Before even we begin to speak of the parental right in education, we are met by the stock argument of our opponents, who address the parent thus: "It is necessary in the interest of the State that your child should be an efficient servant of the commonwealth, and we take upon ourselves the duty of seeing that he is educated."[3] We reply as follows:

1. If hitherto all schools had turned out inefficient servants of the commonwealth, one might discern some justification for this high-handed interference. But what has been the success hitherto in counteracting national inefficiency of that very national system inaugurated in 1876, which many would now impose

[1] *Industrial Efficiency*, by A. Shadwell, vol. ii. p. 390 (Longmans, 1906).

[2] *Ibid.* p. 392. [3] *Daily News*, Feb. 13, 1906.

upon every part of the nation? "The country," writes the author we have quoted, "has steadily declined in efficiency since 1876, when the compulsory law may be said to have inaugurated a national system. That is not due to education, but education has not prevented it."[1]

2. What raises a smile is that men should believe that they can turn out efficient servants of the commonwealth by cutting away the only sure foundation upon which all commonwealths rest, the reverence and obedience inspired by deep religious conviction! The State, though founded for utility, rests not upon utility, but upon duty; duty upon religion; religion upon God, and, in Christian countries, upon God as known by, and acting through, Revelation. Do these new apostles of a modern cult alone possess the secret of evoking the civic virtues in the breast of the young? And does experience in the past elsewhere prove the success of the methods which they now seem anxious to introduce here?

3. It is not a right inherent in the State to educate the children of a nation. The State itself never knew of this supposed right until lately, and is only just rubbing its eyes. It may become the State's duty and the State's right to do so, when parents do not, or cannot avail themselves of their own right, and acquit themselves of their own duty, by educating their own offspring. The State may punish a man for being a bad citizen, and reward him for being a good one; but to make a good citizen is pre-eminently each man's own business, and the business

[1] *Industrial Efficiency*, vol. ii. p. 411.

of those to whom nature itself and nature's God have entrusted his education. As well may the State undertake to feed, and to clothe, and to house the children of the nation, as to educate them. The arguments in all these cases are the same. In proportion as the true and living God vanishes from public life, are we not in danger of insensibly reviving that product of paganism, the deification of the State? We are going back to Lycurgus, and Hobbes, and Rousseau, if we allow that the child, as soon as born, belongs to the State. Yet the theory is by no means dead, and is gaining ground. It is mainly held by such as hope to redress the inequalities of society, and at the same time to improve their own position by investing the State with universal ownership. Such a theory makes the State omnipotent, and permits it to effect any policy and to enforce any measure which it deems to be in its own interest. This interest may be termed "the public good"; but the public good means no more and no less than the advantage of the majority or of the party in power. The *common good*, on the other hand, to which every just and wise State should primarily tend, has an eye to the advantage and respects the rights of every member of the community. Let the State procure the *public good*, but not at the sacrifice of the *common good*, or of the *private good*, otherwise we live under a despotism.

4. The parent, for the reason that he has brought his child into being, has the duty of giving his child a good education. Therefore he has the right to do so, and an inalienable right; since every man possesses the inalienable right to fulfil his own moral

duties. What is, when viewed in him, a duty, becomes a right when viewed in regard to possible interference from others. True, every right does not involve the duty to use it, the matter of a right being very often what is simply lawful ; but every duty involves the right to perform it, and it is of the very nature of every right, that it sets up in all who are aware of it the obligation of not interfering with its exercise. This right to educate his offspring is given the parent by nature, not conferred by the State, and it is the State's duty to protect it. Moreover, the parent is the competent and proper judge of what that education is to be which shall be for his child's best advantage. Every man is the proper and competent judge of what is good or evil to himself, and in his child the parent sees a continuation and appendage of his own being.

5. It follows that if ever the State should, with or without sufficient reason, either acting on its own initiative, or constrained by the march of events, absorb the education of a country, it violates a sacred and inalienable parental right, if it does not guarantee to the parent that which is to him of supreme moment in the education of his child. To many parents this is secular instruction, to a Catholic parent it can be naught else than the proper training of his child in his own religion, and this can only be imparted by Catholic teachers, in Catholic schools, under Catholic oversight in all that regards religious teaching and influence, Hence one of the resolutions, passed by the Catholic hierarchy in 1894, ran as follows: "That to take the management of schools, intended for Catholic children, out of the hands of those who

represent the religious convictions of their parents, and to place it in the hands of public ratepayers who cannot represent those convictions, is a violation of parental rights, to be resisted as an unwarrantable attack upon religious liberty and upon a fundamental law of nature."

6. It follows also that this is a right which the parents of any religious body can justly demand, and that we in demanding it are not claiming to be placed upon any footing of privilege. If other religious bodies do not make the same claim, if they are prepared to adopt in their schools a Lay Confession of Faith or Parliamentary Syllabus, that is their own concern. They are foregoing an undoubted right, but their example binds no one. All men, too, and all bodies of men, every school of thought, every complexion of belief or unbelief, subscribing to formulas or not, are equal before our Law. What the State does for one section of the taxed and rated commonalty, it should do impartially for all sections. It should build schools for the party of Creed, if it build them for the party of No-Creed. It should call upon the party of No to build, if it call upon the party of Yea. And it is a futile objection to say that it is not the business of the State to teach religion. To teach religion or to provide religious teaching is not the business of the State, taken as such, but it is the State's interest and duty to protect religion as the surest basis of public order, and from the moment that the State assumes a parent's right, it is bound to administer that right in all its integrity, just as a guardian is. Then it becomes the State's duty, not indeed to impart religious teaching, but to provide

for its imparting in accordance with the parent's wishes. These principles meet perhaps with scant favour from many, but they are logically sound, and their soundness has long been admitted by the political wisdom of Germany.

Such has ever been the Catholic position; such it is in the face of the present crisis; such it will remain when that crisis has reached its consummation. We make no claim but such as any religious body may rightfully make, though it has been left to us to make it with most insistency. We sue for no favour; we demand but our rights. We bear our full share of the public burdens; we only ask that our levy be not returned to us in a form which we cannot accept. The principles we maintain are recognized by English Law in the case of pauper and semi-criminal children; and we cannot see why the children of the honest working classes should receive less tender consideration. After all the sacrifices which we and our fathers have made in the cause of Catholic Education, it will astonish no one if any measure, which gives a death-wound to a cause so dear to us, never ceases to be regarded by us with profound and bitter dissatisfaction. For more than two hundred and fifty years English Law was such that the Catholics of England and Ireland had, like smugglers, to get their education abroad, or to put up with such poor education as they could pick up at home by stealth. It will be a strange sight if that political party which once gave us Emancipation, and gave us our own schools, now takes those schools away or renders them an unprofitable boon. It is easy to meet the religious difficulty by disposing

of religion altogether: but there is another way of meeting it, and that is to live and let live.

We appear to be standing on the brink of a grave national danger. That danger amounts to nothing short of the elimination of Christianity from the daily life of the young of the nation; and we cannot make it too clear to friend and foe, to believer and unbeliever, that we, as Catholics, will play no part in achieving what we deem would amount to a national disaster. "One thing is most certain," to recall the words of Cardinal Manning, "Catholics will never lend as much as a finger or a vote to overturn by political action the Christianity which still lingers in our public laws. They will cherish all of it that remains in our popular education. If we could see the tradition of our national Christianity healed of its wounds and taken up into the full life and unity of perfect faith by the spiritual forces of conviction and of persuasion, as that supernatural unity was created in the beginning, we should rejoice with thanksgiving; but no Catholic will diminish by a shade the Christianity which still survives. We cannot, indeed, co-operate by any direct action to uphold what we believe to be erroneous; but it will find no political hostility in us. They who wish its overthrow would pull it down not for what we think erroneous in it, but for what is true; and what is true in it we revere as the truth of God. In our divided religious state the public revenues, once paid into the treasury, have passed beyond the individual conscience. Thenceforward they fall under the impartial administration of our mixed commonwealth. I am not responsible for the

application of them. My conscience is not touched if public revenues are given to a Presbyterian or to a Baptist school. My conscience is not ill at ease even if grants are made to a school in which no religion at all is taught. A people divided in religion pays its taxes, and a Parliament divided in religion votes the public money by an equitable balance for our manifold uses in the midst of our manifold divisions. No one has a right to control this mixed administration to satisfy his private conscience, or to claim to have it all his own way. No Secularist can regard my schools with more aversion than I regard his; but I am passive when he receives his share of the public money. I trust the day will never come when any one section or sect among us shall gain a domination over the equities which render tolerable our divided state. I hope no Puritans will rise up again to do in England, by the help of Secularists and unbelievers, what they did in Maryland. There they destroyed the fairest promise of peace that a wrecked world ever saw. England at this time is Maryland upon an imperial scale. He who shall break our religious peace will go down to history with those whose names Englishmen try to forget." [1]

LENT, 1906.

[1] *Vatican Decrees and Civil Allegiance*, pp. 137–8.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.

THE EDUCATION BILL

BY THE REV. M. F. GLANCEY,
Member of the Birmingham School Board.

THE Education Bill (1902), which passed the second reading in the House of Commons on May 8th by a majority of 237, marks an epoch in the history of education in this country. In the following pages it is proposed to give some account of its provisions, and to point out how Catholic schools are likely to be affected.

The main principles of the Bill may be classed thus :—

(1) The creation of one authority for all grades of education in areas of suitable size ;
(2) The constitution of the committee through which the local authority acts ;
(3) The financial proposals of the Bill ;
(4) The relation of denominational schools to the new authority in regard to
 (*a*) Maintenance ;
 (*b*) Control.
(5) The provision of new schools.

I.—The Local Authority.

Hitherto there has existed a multitude of authorities in the province of education. For some considerable time, however, educationists have been practically unanimous in urging that unity should supplant multiplicity, *i.e.*, that within given areas one authority should be appointed to control all kinds of education below that of the university. Occasionally one hears an educationist confessing that he has never been an enthusiast for one authority for all kinds of education. Mr. Acland, in a recent letter to the *Times*, hardly appears to be aflame with zeal for what he calls the "one authority plan." Others again who at one time were clamorous for one authority allowed their advocacy to cool when they began to discover who was likely and who was not likely to be that authority. But apart from these slight deflections it may be said that the current of opinion has set steadily in the direction of unity of authority. But here, as Sir John Gorst has told us, agreement ends. Once we begin to set forth this general principle in concrete form divergence begins.

MINOR BOROUGHS.

Under the Bill county and county borough councils are constituted the local authority for both primary and secondary education, and at the same time non-county boroughs with a population of 10,000 and urban district councils with a population of 20,000 are constituted the authority for elementary education within their area. At first sight this would appear to be an infringement of the principle of unity, inasmuch as the areas for

primary and secondary education are different; and while within the area of the county there is one authority for primary and secondary education, there is a multitude of authorities for primary education in areas which are carved out of the county. On the one hand it is, of course, possible to press abstract ideas of unity too far; and the question is whether or not this unity is sufficient for practical purposes. While some object to the county area as too small, others object to it as being too wide to be workable. Those who take this latter view will, I presume, look with favour on the carving out of the county of the minor boroughs and urban district councils. That these minor boroughs and urban district councils will have some sort of authority in educational matters is, I suppose, inevitable. Hence the whole question centres in the kind of authority they are to have. Should their authority be direct and absolute as in the Bill, or should it come to them by mere delegation? And if direct, what population should qualify for its possession? As at present advised, I incline not to a direct but to a delegated authority. The general sovereignty of the county council will safeguard the principle of unity, and will save many a minor borough from the narrow cramping influence of local bumbledom — an influence which, unless closely watched, will have a tendency towards stifling educational efforts. For we cannot close our eyes to the fact that minor boroughs and urban district councils exhibit startling varieties of character which may operate to the detriment of education. Not all by any means are as enlightened as that under which it is my privilege to live—the plucky little council that

in defence of the rights of the district has just fought a great railway company and beaten it. But this is a favourable and exceptional case. Would it not therefore be in the interests of these minor boroughs and districts to come under the sway of the county council, to share in the county rate, and not to be shut up within their own narrow sphere? Of course the Bill provides that they may voluntarily surrender their powers and functions to the county councils; but it is not at all likely that they would do so. The more incompetent they were the more tenaciously would they cling to their autonomy. Vested in a little brief authority they would play all sorts of fantastic tricks before high heaven. They will, as I have said, have at least a delegated authority. The Bill provides that the county council may delegate its authority; and in the nature of things it is clear that if the county council is to exercise effective control over all education it will have to delegate many of its powers to other bodies. In any case if the minor boroughs and councils are to be endowed with direct authority, the population required to qualify for this authority should be considerably in excess of the 10,000 and 20,000 assigned respectively in the Bill. Others again have suggested 500,000 as the limit; but is not this running to the opposite extreme?

THE COUNTY COUNCIL.

The local authority set up by the Bill is the county or county borough council. And we are told that a council composed of experts in lunacy, gas, sewage and road-making are not a suitable educational authority.

Men whose minds are flooded with water schemes and are pre-occupied with questions of lunacy—who, it is thus mildly insinuated, are suffering from a sort of water on the brain—are not an ideal authority in matters of education. These objectors seem to forget that as a matter of fact the councils are already an authority in the domain of secondary education, and that Schools of Art and Technical Schools are in their control. That these institutions have prospered under their management is not denied. If they have been successful in such secondary education as has heretofore been entrusted to them it is by no means evident that they must fulfil the gloomy prophecy of failure in elementary education and in education generally. Their past record is good ; they enter on the work with clean hands ; they have done nothing as a body to forfeit public confidence in their willingness to deal out even-handed justice to all schools under their jurisdiction. This is more than can be said for the School Boards which are practically the only alternative authority. Speaking generally School Boards have made it a cardinal point of educational policy to thwart and hamper Voluntary Schools, to arrest their growth and development, and to cripple them by ruinous competition with a view to their ultimate extinction or absorption. Could School Boards, with such a record, be trusted to deal fairly by Voluntary Schools in the future ? Is it not more likely that, confirmed in a position of authority, their traditional hostility to Voluntary Schools would break out with a renewed virulence that would again be fatal to educational progress ? In making a fresh start it is essential that the policy of oppression and

antagonism should cease, and therefore that a paramount authority should be set up that has clean hands.

"AD HOC."

But in the eyes of the objectors the original sin of the county council is that they were elected for purposes other than educational; and it is contended that no body is fit to take charge of education unless it has been elected for that specific purpose—elected *ad hoc*, as the phrase goes. And when it is asked why education should be so specially privileged the answer given is, because of its supreme importance. Is every matter of importance then to be treated in the same way? I can quite understand some arguing that health is quite as important a matter as education, and that therefore not a mere committee of the council, but a special body, should be elected for the purpose of dealing with all matters connected with the health of the community. And so on with other matters. Again, why do not the objectors carry the *ad hoc* principle to its logical conclusion? Why do they stop short at local bodies, and not apply it to Parliament itself? If county councillors are not fit to take charge of education, are Members of Parliament, elected for a variety of general purposes, fit to be entrusted with educational legislation? Thus the principle logically applied will set up a number of Liliputian Parliaments.

II.—The Education Committee.

From the authority itself let us now pass to the committee through which, according to the Bill, the

authority must act. The committee, the Bill tells us, is to be constituted according to a scheme drawn up by the council and approved by the Board of Education. The majority of the committee must be representatives of the council, and the minority are appointed by the council on the nomination, where it appears desirable, of other bodies.

ITS CONSTITUTION.

To judge from the criticism passed upon this proposal for the constitution of the Educational Committee one would suppose that statutory committees had never been thus constituted since the beginning of the world. And yet we have only to look just a little beyond our noses to see the precise* scheme in actual operation. The Technical School Committee consists of fifteen members. Of these eight—a bare majority—are members of the council as such, and the remaining seven are the nominees of other bodies or interests, viz., two represent the University, two the School Board, one the Midland Institute, and two are artisans' representatives. Thus we have the two essential principles, viz., a majority of the council and the representatives of "other bodies" actually at work in the Technical School. All these years two members of the Liberal party have represented the School Board on the committee of the Technical School; and I have not heard that the School Board when the Liberal party were in power ever contemplated passing a self-denying ordinance, or protesting against the representation of

* The particular Technical School Committee here described is that in Birmingham.

interests on the committee of the Technical School. Why then should they be in arms against the Bill which pays them the compliment of asserting a principle they have been practising for so many years ?

Last year's Bill provided that the majority of the committee must consist of county councillors ; the new Bill merely stipulates that the majority shall consist of members selected and appointed by the council. This is denounced as a retrograde step ; frankly it seems to me an improvement. The council, if it sees fit, may appoint its own members ; but if the council thinks that this course will tax or drain its strength too much, or if it thinks that it can get together a stronger committee from elsewhere—a committee that will deal with education more efficiently—why in the name of common sense should it not be allowed to appoint others ? The only answer is, because such a committee is not sufficiently representative of the popular will. The arrangement will probably make for efficiency, but it may not stand, because it does not conform to political ideals of popular representation. Thus is it seriously proposed to sacrifice efficiency to a mere political shibboleth.

POPULAR CONTROL.

This brings us into close quarters with the fundamental assumption underlying all arguments against the proposed composition of the committee, viz., that efficiency goes hand in hand with popular control, that the more popularly representative an assembly is the more efficient it is.

Popular control! I have often asked myself the question, what does popular control mean, and where do the people live who are to exercise it? So far as I can understand the matter "the people" are all those who are born under the same flag, have the same protection from the State, the same rights and privileges, the same advantages of citizenship and in return pay the same rates and taxes and bear the same public burdens. If this description of the people be correct, I ask, who are the people for whom the right of popular control is demanded? Do they not possess it and exercise it already? We have been labouring under the impression that denominationalists formed the greater part of "the people," and that they were exercising some sort of control over the work of education. Is it true that I am mistaken and that education is now at length to be handed over fully and perfectly to the control of those who can claim emphatically to be "the people"? But I fear that the news is too good to be true, and that by "the people" we are to understand merely an aggressive minority. I am all for popular control, but let us understand who "the people" are, and what is the nature of their control. The only perfect popular control is the control exercised by experts for the purpose of securing the most efficient education that meets the claims and desires of the people as one vast community.

It has been said that the weakness of this arrangement for constituting the committee lies in the fact that the control is so far removed from the people that if things went wrong they could not be set right until public opinion had gone through three stages. First

the county council would have to be roused, then the county council would in turn stir up the education committee, which again would put pressure on the local managers. In reply, in addition to the principles I have just enunciated, I would further submit that the difficulty is more fanciful than real. The same triple process has to be gone through in the case of the Municipal Technical School, and yet one does not hear of any insuperable difficulty on this head in connection with that school. Why then, should the education committee or the local managers be less amenable to reason than the managers and committee of the Technical School? And so it is not at all apparent why the proposed arrangement should be such an "effective recipe for humdrum inefficiency."

ENLARGE THE COUNCIL?

The further suggestion has been made that the county or city council should be enlarged by the election of an additional member for each ward; such member, while taking part in the general business of the council, to be called and to be the educational member. Apart from the serious objections to such an enlargement of the city council, I cannot think that this ingenious device for combining *ad hoc-ism* with municipalization would ever work. It would set up an *imperium in imperio*—one practically sovereign power within another; it would weaken the authority of the county council by setting up a practically rival authority receiving a direct mandate from the people in the matter of education—a mandate that would not be held by the majority of the council; and so in the event

of a collision between the committee and the council, the council would always be exposed to the danger of receiving an *ad hoc* slap in the face.

REPRESENTATION OF MINORITIES.

Besides, the effect of this proposal—perhaps that is its object—would be to do away with the appointment of members representing other bodies or interests. This attempt to exclude all representation of bodies that took a practical interest in education long before the State recognized its duties in the matter is one of the most shameless dodges of the campaign, and shows how implacable is the hostility of our opponents. For us Catholics the constitution of the committee as safeguarding the rights of minorities is vital, seeing that we are in a minority almost everywhere. Hence Mr. Yoxall, who tells us he has no faith in denominational education, has suggested that the Bill should lay down that due regard should be had to the representation of minorities in appointing the committee. We ask merely for an adequate substitute for the cumulative vote, viz., that we should have one representative on the Education Committee of every authority in whose area we have schools. All along we have held it to be essential that there should be on the committee representatives of the great educational interests which have grown up with the Board of Education. In this connection it seems to me that Section 12 (2) (*a*) needs strengthening. It provides that the council shall appoint members of the committee "on the nomination, where it appears desirable, of other bodies." It is a pity that the wording is not more absolute. The words

"where it appears desirable" may open the door to endless controversies if the council should happen to be unreasonable. If these "other bodies" think it "desirable" that they should nominate, and the council thinks otherwise the point can be referred to the Board of Education. But after the decision has been given in favour of the other bodies it will still be possible for the council to refuse to appoint the nominees unless it is forced to appoint by a clause declaring that the appointment shall not be unreasonably or capriciously withheld.

III.—Finance.

We may now glance at the financial principles of the Bill.

ONE RATING AUTHORITY.

At present, as Mr. Balfour said in his speech in introducing the Bill, there are two authorities both dealing with the rates, one of which has unlimited power to draw upon the rates for educational purposes without rendering any account to the other, which is nevertheless responsible for the general local finance. Ever since the passing of the Act of 1870 protests have been made against the powers conferred on school boards of pointing a pistol at the head of a municipality with the demand: Your money or your life. Many towns, Birmingham included, at first refused to pay the precept levied by the school board until the law compelled them. This evil the Bill seeks to remedy by unifying the rating authority; and it deserves strong support in its heroic effort to abolish what is a veritable abomination—a multiplicity of rating authorities.

LIMITATION OF RATE.

The Bill leaves it to the discretion of the council to levy what rate it thinks fit for elementary education—no limit being set. Further it empowers the county council to supply or aid the supply of secondary education as far as the "whiskey money" and a twopenny rate will allow. And non-county boroughs and urban district councils which have adopted the powers as to elementary education contained in Part III. of the Bill have concurrent powers to raise a penny rate for higher education. Now it is argued that this limit is absurd. So it might be if it were a cast-iron limit; but with the assent of the Local Government Board—which has the reputation of being an enlightened progressive body—the rate may be increased indefinitely. Then comes the rejoinder: What right has the Local Government Board to interfere? The ratepayers, it is urged, have a perfect right to spend their money as they please, without let or hindrance from the Local Government Board, or any other board. This statement, we submit, is open to question. Have local bodies any such rights? The rights of local bodies are no more and no less than Parliament makes them. Parliament never has given, and I trust never will give to public bodies an absolutely free hand in the spending of money. It has defined the objects on which public money may or may not be spent, and has hedged round the spending of public money with conditions which may not be violated under penalty of a surcharge by the auditor. In a word, Parliament has always recognized that ratepayers have to be protected against public bodies that have the spending of their money.

Whether this is an ideal state of things, and whether it will be so in Utopia is quite another question. You may argue till you are black in the face that the public body being elected by the people are acting merely as the people's representatives, and are carrying out the people's will ; but as long as the great bulk of the people have no adequate elementary knowledge—to say nothing of real grasp—of municipal finance, and all real control is in the hands of a few, it cannot be said in any intelligent sense that the people have any real will in the matter. Until, therefore, the ratepayers understand something of the problems of municipal finance they need some protection against even their own representatives (who, by the way, have often got them into trouble) and, therefore, we must demur to the proposition that the representatives of the ratepayers should be at liberty to spend the ratepayers' money as they think fit. Lest it be thought that these principles have been manufactured with a view to the education controversy, I should like to quote a few words from Professor Nicholson's great work on *The Principles of Political Economy*. Having spoken of municipal authorities which have embarked on various forms of trading enterprises and speculations that have ultimately involved an increase of the rates, he continues : "It seems hopeless to rely on the judgment and self-restraint of the local authorities, and the only effective check seems to be more thorough and severe control from above, and in particular by an increase of the powers of the Local Government Board." Many School Boards—the Birmingham School Board included—have set very arbitrary limits to themselves in

this matter of spending money. When any proposition has come before them to expend rates on voluntary schools they were by no means keen to remove restrictions as to expenditure, and gloried in their limitations. Others, again, with a charming simplicity, try to argue both ways at once. On the one hand they strenuously maintain that no limit should be set to the education rate, while on the other hand they protest against the Bill because it involves an increase in the rates! The agricultural members protest against any increase in the rates on agricultural land. And the National Union of Teachers urged that larger grants should be made from the Imperial Exchequer. Having in days gone by urged that the whole cost of education should be thrown on the Imperial Exchequer, we should gladly support this resolution. But under present conditions the prospect of obtaining larger grants from the Imperial Exchequer does not seem hopeful. On the one hand we should be sorry to throw cold water on the proposal; on the other it would hardly be wise to embarrass the Government on this point at the present crisis in national finance. Still, as representations have been made to the Government from both sides of the House that many localities are not in a position to bear the increased burden, it would be well if the Government could see its way to promise substantial relief, if not immediately, at all events in the near future. They might be disposed to favourably consider, *e.g.*, the suggestion that the Government should be responsible for the teachers' salaries, and leave to localities to find the money for other charges.

IV.—The Local Authority and Denominational Schools.

Next we have to consider the relation in which denominational schools will stand to the new authority, and this relation may be classed under the two heads of (1) maintenance, (2) control.

THE OPTION CLAUSES.

There is no need to waste time with many words about the option clauses of the Bill, which leave the local authority free to adopt or to decline the control of elementary education. In case the local authority declines, voluntary schools will remain in the same impecunious state in which they now are. In one locality they will be relieved, in another they will go unaided, and have to struggle on as before. Thus these option clauses will make confusion so much worse confounded, that one can hardly believe they were seriously intended. Seldom has a Ministerial proposal been greeted with such a chorus of condemnation as these contracting-out clauses. Occasionally a voice crying in the wilderness from Yorkshire may be heard in their favour; but their effect would so obviously nullify the good in the Bill that there is a practically unanimous demand for their withdrawal.

CLAUSE 8.

Assuming then that the local authority will be compelled to take over the charge of elementary schools, it will be their duty to maintain and keep efficient all public elementary schools within their area which are necessary. Till now the two sets of schools, of which

our educational system is made up, have been treated very unequally by the State. While the total cost of education in board schools has been defrayed out of public moneys, the State has subjected denominational schools to a shameless system of sweating by insisting on paying for an article considerably less than the actual cost of production. Because denominational schools taught an extra subject they were forbidden to receive full pay for the subjects which they taught in common with others. Now the Bill essays to remedy this injustice by placing all schools on an equality as to maintenance, and by recognising the principle of an equal wage for equal work.

As Clause 8 of the Bill defines the relation of denominational schools to the local authority, it will be well to give here the text of this clause in full. It reads thus :

Clause 8.—(1) The local authority shall maintain and keep efficient all Public Elementary Schools within their area, which are necessary, subject, in the case of a school not provided by them, to the following conditions :

(*a*) The managers of this school shall carry out any directions of the local education authority as to the secular instruction to be given in the school ;

(*b*) The local education authority shall have power to inspect the school, and the accounts of the managers shall be subject to audit by that authority ;

(*c*) The consent of the local education authority shall be required to the appointment of teachers, but that consent shall not be withheld except on educational grounds ;

(*d*) The managers of the school shall, out of the funds

provided by them, keep the school-house in good repair, and make such alterations and improvements in the buildings as may be reasonably required by the local education authority ;

(*c*) The local education authority shall have the right of appointing such persons as they think fit to be additional managers, so that the number of persons so appointed, if more than one, does not exceed more than one-third of the whole number of managers.

(2) If any question arises under this section between the local education authority and the managers of a school, that question shall be determined by the Board of Education, and compliance with this section shall be one of the conditions required to be fulfilled by an elementary school in order to obtain a Parliamentary grant.

(3) The grant under the Voluntary Schools Act, 1897, in respect of any schools maintained by a local education authority, shall, instead of being distributed by the Board of Education, be paid by that Board to that authority, and shall be applied by that authority in aid to the expenses incurred by them under this part of this Act.

MAINTENANCE.

Under this section it is clear that the local education authority acquires considerable powers over denominational schools. It has perfect control over the secular instruction, the right to inspect the school, to audit the accounts, to appoint one-third of the managers, to disallow the appointment of teachers educationally unfit, and last but not least, it will receive the aid grant which has hitherto been paid to denominational schools. This

gain by the local education authority implies a corresponding surrender of powers and privileges on the part of the managers. What do they receive in return? The Bill professes to relieve them of "maintaining," *i.e.*, of finding the current expenses of carrying on their schools; and it lays upon the local education authority the duty to "maintain and keep efficient" all necessary schools within their area. But the extent to which the local education authority is called upon to "maintain" schools is subject to certain limitations specified in section (*d*), which reads: "The managers of the school shall, out of funds provided by them, keep the school house in good repair, &c." The school house in the Act of 1870—and, therefore, according to Section 18 (3) it bears the same meaning in this Act—is defined to include the teacher's house and the playground, and the offices and all premises belonging to or required for a school. Heretofore "ordinary repairs and minor improvements" of existing premises have been chargeable to "maintenance," *i.e.*, have been charged to the school fund. Now comes the point. Does the clause I have just quoted throw the charge for "ordinary repairs and minor improvements" entirely on the managers? If so the local authority can hardly be said to "maintain" the schools except in a mutilated sense, since it cuts a very big slice from what has heretofore been regarded as "maintenance." It is necessary, therefore, to have the point made perfectly clear whether the word "maintain" is being used in the full sense in which it has hitherto been used, or whether it means maintenance minus the ordinary upkeep of the school house. If it should unfortunately

bear this latter sense, denominationalists will have to seriously consider it. We have agreed to provide sites and buildings, and to make reasonable alterations and improvements, and we agreed on condition of being relieved of the whole cost of maintenance ; but we never contemplated having to provide out of our own funds for any expenses that have till now been reckoned as maintenance. For if the meaning of maintenance is being narrowed down, it will be a very serious question whether many of our schools will be much better off than they were before. No. If we are to surrender all these powers to the local authority ; if we are to surrender the Aid Grant and the right to charge rent for our schools, we must claim in return that the State or the local authority shall bear the whole cost of maintaining them. This has always been put forward as the irreducible minimum of the Catholic demand. It will tax our people to the utmost to find the money necessary for any capital outlay that may be required ; we cannot find money for a large part of maintenance in addition.

CONTROL.

We now come to the thorny question of the control to be exercised upon denominational schools. On one point the Opposition have made a concerted attack. That point is the amount of control that the local authority is to exercise upon denominational schools. Lord Rosebery has declared that "Nonconformists and experts" have good reason to complain of the present system. "Nonconformists and experts!" A peculiar distinction, and hardly in Lord Rosebery's happiest

vein ! Education leagues named from all points of the compass — northern, southern, eastern, western, and midland—with a geographical nomenclature as comprehensive and as delusive as the names of our great railway systems ; the free churches, evangelical and otherwise ; so-called national educational associations ; and a stage-army of speakers, whose ubiquitousness is equalled only by that of a travelling theatrical company ; all this imposing array of talent roundly declare that the Bill gives no control worthy of the name over denominational schools. I said this imposing array. And really it used to impose on me until I noticed that these numerous gatherings were for the most part addressed by the same speakers. Then it ceased to be imposing and became an imposition. Well, the substance of the complaint is that the control given by the Bill is unreal and a sham.

In order to ascertain whether this statement is based on fact or fiction, let us turn to the provisions of the Bill itself. Now what do we find in Clause 8 of the Bill ?

The managers of a denominational school are bound, as a condition of obtaining the parliamentary grant, "to carry out any directions of the local education authority as to the secular instruction to be given in the school." If these words do not give the local authority supreme power over the school in all that appertains to secular instruction I do not know what words can give it. To ensure its instructions being carried out the local authority is further empowered (*a*) to inspect the school ; (*b*) to appoint one-third of the managers ; (*c*) to refuse to allow the appointment of teachers educa-

tionally unfit; (*d*) to audit the accounts. And I challenge any one to mention anything else that is really necessary to secure educational efficiency.

THE POWER OF A MINORITY.

But it is said that the managers appointed by the local authority being only one-third will be in a permanent minority and, therefore, powerless. Has, then, a minority no power? Has not a good deal of eloquence been expended in pointing the finger of scorn at a majority which is powerless for mischief or reform in the presence of a powerful and vigilant minority? One competent manager is quite equal to pointing out when things go wrong and thus of safeguarding the interests of the local authority. A minority might be said, perhaps, to be powerless if everything depended on voting strength, and the minority had no power but that of a vote. But where the minority is an inspecting authority in full communication with the governing body to which it can always make effective appeal, a minority of this kind, if only it has its eyes in its head, is as effective as a majority.

CONCENTRATION.

In this connection a protest is made against the formation of a multitude of what are called "pentagonal school boards." I am bound to confess that I am largely in sympathy with this objection. I feel strongly that denominational schools should consolidate and form themselves into an organization that shall be to them what school boards are to the board schools.

The voluntary schools associations seemed to provide the nucleus of such a body. But, unfortunately, Mr. Balfour tells us that if this Bill becomes law the voluntary schools associations will *ipso facto* cease to exist. Of course one objection to them lay in the fact that their areas are not co-terminous with those of the new authority. Anyhow there seems no reason why facilities should not be given for constituting some such body to take over the management of the schools of a denomination within the area of the local authority. This scheme will do away with all hole-and-corner arrangements ; it will make for efficiency ; and it will greatly facilitate the duties of the local authority. For if each school is to retain its own separate management, the local authority will require a little army of deputies whose sole business will be to travel from one meeting of managers to another.

It is also said that the right of appointing teachers is of the essence of public control. I am utterly sick of all this irrelevant chatter about control, and desiderate a little more generous zeal for educational efficiency. This so-called essence of public control is certainly not essential to educational efficiency. This latter is abundantly secured by the right to reject teachers who are educationally unfit. But this plea, I suspect, is not advanced in the interests of educational efficiency, which after all should be the leading idea dominating all proposals.

V.—Provision of New Schools.

The last principle of the Bill that we now have to consider deals with the provision of new schools.

Nothing in the past perhaps has caused us more irritation than the opposition we have encountered from school boards when we proposed to build new schools. The way was barred by the plea that the proposed school was "unnecessary." But schools technically unnecessary were really necessary — hence the grievance.

THE CONDITIONS.

Under the Bill any one may propose to provide a new public elementary school; and if after three months' notice has been given no objection is lodged, the school will be allowed. In case of dispute the Board of Education is to decide whether the school is necessary or not; and in framing its decision is bound to have regard to three things: (*a*) the interests of secular instruction; (*b*) the wishes of parents as to the education of their children; (*c*) the economy of the rates.

Mr. Balfour, in explaining this part of the Bill, dwelt exclusively on the second of these conditions, viz., the wishes of the parents; and from his speech it would be easy to gather the impression that the wishes of the parents were to be the chief factor in determining whether a new public elementary school is allowable or not. But in the Bill itself this condition is sandwiched between two others, viz., the interests of secular education and economy of the rates. Now it is important to know which of these conditions is to carry most weight. Otherwise it will always be possible for the Board of Education, according to the ideas of the Minister in power, to play off one against the other, and to pit the interests of secular education

against the wishes of the parents. If the wishes of the parents are in favour of the proposed new school and the interests of secular education are against it, which view is to prevail? And the same question may be asked in the event of the wishes of the parents colliding with the economy of the rates. All this shows how essential to the smooth working of the Bill is an equitable spirit at the Board of Education.

NUMBER OF CHILDREN.

The number of children required to prevent a new school from being declared "unnecessary" is nowhere stated in the Bill; but it is quite clear that the number cannot be less than thirty, since no existing school is safe that has less than thirty. This part of the Bill needs closely watching, else schools which have weathered the storm in the troublous times before and since 1870 may now founder.

If we follow the precedent established in Germany we find that the number of children required for authorizing the setting up of a new school varies in the different States; but the average number is about thirty. That seems a reasonable number; and the fact that the Government has fixed on this number for existing schools seems to indicate that they have this number in mind. After all there is no particular reason in the nature of things why the number should vary in new and old schools.

WHY ILLUSORY?

It has been declared that these concessions as to the building of new schools, at least as far as Noncon-

formists are concerned, are "illusory." Why illusory? Is it because the Nonconformists have been nourishing a hope that under the new Education Bill they would have schools built for them in abundance at the public expense, and now finding that the Bill gives them perfect liberty to build for themselves as many schools as they require, they say the Bill is illusory? Or is it illusory only because what advantages they might still get under the Bill are shared by denominationalists? If such be the case I can thoroughly appreciate how illusory indeed the Bill is. The permission to build new schools in areas in which we have been free to build, has proved anything but illusory in our case; and why should it be so in the case of Nonconformists? All these years they have been proclaiming it as a grievance that in 8,000 parishes there is no suitable school for them. The Bill provides a remedy for this grievance, but they still find the Bill illusory. That they had a grievance we have always admitted; and the remedy provided by the Bill is one we Catholics have applied with success, and it is one which Nonconformists are much better able to apply than we are.

We admit that, like ourselves, the Nonconformists, particularly in the rural districts, will continue to labour under serious disadvantages. On this account we nourish a fellow-feeling towards them. But we cannot join them in unqualified opposition to the Bill. The Bill does remove some grievances, and is certainly a step in the right direction. Would it not therefore be more statesmanlike to accept the boon that is now offered, and to agitate later on for complete redress?

REFUSAL TO PAY RATES.

In this connection it may not be out of place to say a word on the objection that is being made to the payment of rates, as it is alleged, for religious teaching. Nonconformists have a conscientious objection, we are told, to the allocation of rates to schools that teach any special creed. I do wish Nonconformists would try to look at the question of religious teaching in board schools with our eyes. All these years they have had provided for them out of the rates in board schools a religious teaching that was just the thing they wanted, and was just the thing we did not want. So while they have paid for what suited them we have been compelled to pay for what was of no use whatever to us. Undenominational teaching is as much against our conscience as denominational teaching is against theirs. In answer to this Mr. Hugh Price Hughes tells us that undenominational teaching puts all religious bodies on a footing of absolute equality. On a former occasion I was permitted to explain at some length that, at least as far as Catholics are concerned, this is absolutely incorrect; and I have no space to repeat these reasons now. But I will go further and say that even if there were a certain number of truths common to all, yet the fundamental principle of undenominationalism, viz., the reducing of all religions to a common denominator, is utterly at variance with our principles of religious belief. When, therefore, Nonconformists threaten a refusal to pay the rates I would remind them that there is no possible argument by which they justify refusing to pay rates, that would not have justified us Catholics in

refusing to pay rates to the board schools. But although we have had a clear grievance we have preferred to suffer rather than seek redress by violent and unconstitutional methods.

The crowning objection to this part of the Bill is that it will involve an increase in the number of denominational schools. Does any one suppose that the Bill would be worth a rushlight if it did not allow the legitimate expansion of denominational schools? Why should not denominational schools be allowed to increase and multiply? Surely one of the main excellences of the proposed Bill is that denominational schools will benefit by a tardy act of justice and be delivered from a too-long continued system of oppression.

For these reasons, then, we approve the main principles of the Bill, but we demand the withdrawal of the option clauses, and ask that all public elementary schools should be maintained, not in a mutilated sense, but in the fullest sense of the term, out of public funds. Finally, we urge the Government to place the measure on the Statute-book this session, as the withdrawal of another educational Bill will cover them with ridicule for all time.

THE BISHOPS AND SECONDARY EDUCATION

The Cardinal Archbishop and Bishops of the Province of Westminster, in their Low Week meeting, 1902, passed the following resolutions for the guidance of those engaged in the secondary education of the Catholic youth in England :—

I.—Bearing in mind the constant teaching of the Catholic Church as to the dangers and evils arising from mixed education, and the recent decision of the Holy See, that Catholic boys are not to be educated in the Protestant public schools of England, the Bishops again declare it to be of the highest importance to provide the Catholic youth of both sexes with secular instruction, primary and secondary, that shall be equal in efficiency to any in the country, while every care continues to be taken to conduct their education under Catholic influence, in a Catholic atmosphere, and according to Catholic principles.

II.—They advise Catholic colleges and schools for secondary education, as also teachers and tutors to be engaged in secondary education, to accept the National Scheme for Registration, contained in the recent Order in Council, and to comply with its regulations to the best of their ability.

III.—They think it desirable that as many teachers as possible, whether members of teaching orders or con-

gregations, of either sex, or members of the secular clergy and laity, should qualify themselves by obtaining the official diploma instituted for teachers in secondary education.

IV.—They call attention to the fact that for the training of women, whether religious or lay, two normal training colleges have been established under the direction of the Bishops, one in London by the Sisters of the Holy Child, Cavendish Square, and the other in Liverpool by the Sisters of Notre Dame ; and that they have been officially recognized by the Board of Education as normal training colleges for Catholic women, and as duly qualified to prepare candidates for the diploma.

The Bishops desire that suitable provision be made, either within these colleges or in their immediate neighbourhood, for the accommodation of the religious Sisters, who must be personally present three terms, or thirty weeks, during the year of training needed to qualify for the diploma.

V.—As to the training of masters for secondary education, this may probably be carried on in some of our larger colleges upon the apprenticeship system, and for ecclesiastics at St. Edmund's Hall, Cambridge. But for the benefit of those laymen who cannot be received into these colleges or into St. Edmund's Hall, the Bishops suggest that, as a beginning, a hostel be established under proper supervision, in connection with St. Francis Xavier's College, Liverpool, and that in case of this not sufficing to meet the demand, a second hostel be opened in connection with some Catholic college, in or near London.

VI.—The Bishops require that, wherever it becomes necessary or desirable to supplement the teaching given in Catholic colleges and hostels by taking advantage of lectures open to the public, the Superiors in charge of the houses shall bear in mind and be guided by the principle enunciated in the first of these resolutions, as to the necessity of maintaining a thoroughly Catholic system of education. It must be remembered by all that the work of Catholic education is everywhere under the jurisdiction and visitation of the Church, in whatever concerns the religious training and formation of her children.

The Bishops and the Bill.

At a meeting of the Committee of Bishops with a sub-committee of the Catholic School Committee, held at Archbishop's House, May 9, 1902, it was agreed that the following points, among others, will need special attention while the Education Bill is in the Committee stage :—

I. That on no consideration can we give way to the proposal to allow the local education or other authority to nominate more than one-third of the number of managers for a denominational school—such nominee to be on the board of management only for the purposes of the Education Acts.

II. That the proposal to throw upon the trustees of the school the cost of lighting, warming, and cleaning, as also that of "ordinary repairs" and "minor improvements"—all of which have hitherto been recognized by the Board of Education as part of "maintenance"

chargeable on the grant—must be resisted as destructive.

III. That the Court of Appeal, open to teachers on dismissal, be to the Board of Education rather than to the local education authority, and that, if the teacher be dismissed on religious grounds, the religious tenets or requirements of the denomination to which the school belongs be held as sufficient ground for dismissal.

IV. That no school shall be considered unnecessary, in consequence of the passing of the Bill, that is at present subject to Government inspection and in the receipt of a Government grant.

V. That the scheme of large areas is preferable to that of the smaller ones, of non-county boroughs and urban districts.

VI. That the principle of an appeal to the Board of Education be carefully guarded throughout the Bill.

VII. That the optional clause be deleted.

THE CATHOLIC ASPECT OF THE EDUCATION QUESTION[1]

By BERTRAM C. A. WINDLE, M.D., F.R.S.

THERE may be many excellent Catholics who are sick to death of the sound of the words "Education Question." I do not wonder at it. Personally I should feel deeply thankful if I never had to meet them again. But the Education Question is still with us; indeed it never was more acutely present than it is at the present moment, and, weary though we may be of it, we must once more turn to our task and keep pegging away until we have finally secured for our children that form of education which alone our consciences will permit us to accept. The task is heavy and seems to the pessimistically inclined almost impossible, but courage, unanimity, and determination will yet carry the day. There is nothing to be gained by minimizing our difficulties, and I do not propose to do so. There is everything to be gained by knowing what they are, and what we want, and what we are determined to have at all costs. To go into a

[1] A Paper read at the Catholic Conference held at Birmingham, September 26–28, 1904.

conflict of this kind knowing exactly what one wants is half the battle, and I hope that we shall have fully made up our minds as to what we can accept before the issue is fully knit.

The Advance in the Act of 1902.

The Education Act of 1902 was a very great advance from the educational point of view. No one but a bigot, an ignoramus, or a wilful perverter of the truth—and we have all of these in this happy land—can deny this. I admit it in spite of the fact that it has increased rather than lessened the difficulties of the Catholic schools, at least at the present time. Those who take very little intelligent interest in the Education Question, and alas! they are the vast majority of our body, and of the inhabitants of the country, imagined that the Act was intended to terminate all our troubles and put an end to all our sorrows. If we were to listen to the loud-tongued orators of the opposite side, who spend so much of their time in assuring the ignorant audiences to whom they address their fairy tales that this Act was conceived in the interests of Catholics and Anglicans, we might well suppose that our difficulties were all at an end. Those of us who knew something more about the matter were perfectly well aware, whilst it was still a Bill, that the Act would do nothing of the kind, and did our best to make this clear whenever we had an opportunity, but I doubt if any of us thought that the Act could make things quite so difficult for some of our schools as has actually been the case. I hope it

will be understood that in what I am going to say I am not alluding to Birmingham. If the Act had been administered in all places as it has been here, I do not think that either we or any other body of citizens would have had much reason to complain. But then this has not been the case, and it is just this fact which has set at fault those who thought that the Act would make things easier for our schools than it has. We imagined that it would be worked by persons having an eye mainly, if not solely, to the interests of education. It is most disheartening to find how false has been this supposition. I am not now alluding to the state of affairs in Wales, though I should like to draw some interesting parallels in connection with circumstances which are taking place there and those which have been known to occur in other parts of the realm. I am alluding to the kind of things which one reads of constantly in the daily papers, things which show us that some, at any rate, of the so-called education authorities think first of how they can hamper the non-provided schools, and afterwards, if at all, of whether they are serving the cause of education—a subject with which, by the way, many of such persons have scarcely a nodding acquaintance.

Let us consider this point from the side of the secondary schools. The Act, for the first time, brought these schools under the cognizance of the local authority, and a very excellent thing that was. Now such schools may or may not want to derive money from public sources. If they do not, blessed are they, for they need trouble their heads neither about local nor national authorities. Such schools, in

our case at least, are a small minority, and I am not alluding to them in what I have to say. Most of our grammar schools, at least, and I only wish we had more of them, need other support than that which they can gain from the fees of their pupils, if they are to do their work properly and compete with the non-Catholic institutions around them, many of which owe their position to endowments given by Catholic donors, and for Catholic purposes. Now these schools of ours can obtain the help which they require if they fulfil the requisite conditions from both local and national sources. I should like to know how many of them have obtained or are likely to obtain any help from local sources. A reasonable person would ask whether the education of a secular character given in such a school was equal to that given in a purely secular institution, and, after learning that it was, would at once agree that the secular instruction ought to be assisted out of the ratepayers' money, since it was provided for and utilized by the ratepayers' children.

Local Authorities and Catholic Schools.

But the fact remains that we do not derive assistance from such sources, and this simply because we give religious instruction. Such is the idea of fairness which flourishes in some minds. But the local authority can go further than this. The Education Department can give aid, and fairly substantial aid, to secondary schools; and let me, *en passant*, say how admirable are the new regulations for secondary schools which have recently been issued, and how

important for our schools. But before such aid is given the local authority is consulted as to whether the school is a necessary or useful part of the local scheme of education. A local authority with a conscience would reply, "There are a number of Catholics here, doubtless a deluded folk, but still desiring an education in which stress is laid upon religious matters; and since there are such queer persons, who, after all, are ratepayers, and who—it must be admitted—give a very excellent secular education in addition to their religious teaching, we think that you should certainly help them, though," as they would illogically add, in many cases, "we shall certainly not give them anything ourselves." But it is in the power of the local authority to hamper, perhaps even to prevent, a school from obtaining a grant from the Treasury because it is a place where religion is taught. This is a distinct blot on the Act.

When it comes to the question of Pupil Teacher Centres the matter is even more serious. Every person interested in education knows that the question of the training of teachers lies at the very bottom of the whole educational problem. With respect to the training of pupil teachers, which is the first rung in the ladder, we might have taken up one of two attitudes. We might have decided to send our children to a common centre, with the right of entry for religious teaching, and have, in addition, provided hostels where they could live and be brought up under Catholic supervision, or we might have adopted the plan of providing separate centres for the education of our own teachers.

From the number of our schools, from the number of teachers whom we require, and from our position as ratepayers, we were, and are, perfectly entitled to demand either of these measures. We have chosen the latter, and I am not going to take up time by giving the arguments in favour of that line of action.

Now Pupil Teacher Centres can also obtain grants from local and national sources. We have every right to assistance from local sources. We are providing teachers for local schools in which local children will be educated, and where, very much against our own wishes, we are obliged to receive the children of parents professing any or no religion, as well as our own children for whom the schools were intended and provided. Yet in at least a large number of cases all assistance from the rates has been refused to our Pupil Teacher Centres. But more than this, in some places at least, the local authority, though it was not asked to allot a single copper to the support of the centre, has refused to permit such a centre to exist, in so far as it can refuse, by declining to recognize it, and thus doing its best to cut it off from national as well as local resources. We have yet to learn how far this policy may be tolerated by the Board of Education. It is generally supposed that all kinds of knowledge are valuable and worth possessing, but one could have dispensed with the knowledge that there were men and women in this country capable of perpetrating such an outrage in the name of religious equality. My hope is that these things have only been done—and I recognize that it is only in certain ill-favoured localities that they have taken place—in the first

flush of responsibility, and that when the real needs of the education of the children of this country come more home to the minds of the too-often ignorant persons to whose tender mercies such needs are entrusted, saner counsels may prevail, and more thought be taken of the future inhabitants of this land, and less of the temporary success of some local religious struggle.

Our Elementary Schools.

Turning now to the question of the elementary schools, I am confronted with the fact that there are some persons who seem to think that, on the whole, we have done well in this direction. I find—to my surprise and delight—that the land of Leicester is one flowing with milk and honey. It is not the place where I myself should have looked for an abundance of kine and bees for Catholic use; but one never knows, and I can only congratulate those who live in that favoured spot. I turn to the condition of the rest of South Britain, and here again I exclude Wales—a locality from which one does not expect much. Now here, in this country, the Act has been in some cases fairly carried out, and in others unfairly. The Act, as must necessarily be the case with any measure conferring large powers upon popularly elected bodies, afforded innumerable loopholes for harassing and annoying the voluntary schools. It was one which could be worked with great unfairness, and possibly the Act could not otherwise have been framed if it were to carry out the statesmanlike objects which its originators had

in mind. Let us be thankful that in—I think I am right in saying—the large majority of places the Act has been not unfairly administered, and that, at least in most cases, our teachers, who have up to this borne so large a portion of the intolerable strain, are now properly remunerated. We have not fully reached this last ideal here in Birmingham, but, on the whole, I recognize with gratitude that our schools have received fair, if not exactly cordial, treatment.

How they may be Treated under the Act.

But if any person desires to learn how the voluntary schools may be treated within the four corners of the Act by persons devoid of decent feeling and desirous of harassing, as far as possible, those who are opposed to them, let him read the articles which have recently appeared in the *Times* on the methods of the Welsh education authorities towards the hapless schools which now lie at their mercy. It is of little profit, however, to pursue this inquiry, for I suppose no person is so sanguine as to imagine that the present Act, as it stands, will exist for ever, or perhaps even for any great length of time. Even if a Government of the complexion of the present does not find it necessary to do something in the way of modifying the law, some day or another the popular vote will give us a Liberal administration pledged to alter the Education Act. It will be an interesting spectacle, or would be if it were not one of such vital importance, to see such an administration, perhaps under the sway of Mr. Lloyd George, attempting to tinker with this measure. One feels a glow of thank-

fulness when one reflects that the task will not be one of any great ease, and that there will be more than one interest which will have to be fully satisfied before any alteration can find its way on to the statute book. But let that pass.

What are we to do?

In the face of present political affairs it is at least of great importance that we should make up our mind as to what we want and what we will accept, and to make it abundantly clear, to all whom it may concern, that with anything less than our rights we will not be satisfied. Moreover, we should let it be clearly known that we are not prepared to be treated with injustice, and that we will resist by every means in our power—and I think we might, if we choose, make ourselves quite as unpleasant as the Passive Resisters—any arbitrary interference with our rights to give our children the kind of religious teaching which is desired for them by their parents. We do not desire to give it to the children of others. If we could reserve our own schools for our own children I believe we should all be grateful for the privilege, but our own children we must have, and that we must make perfectly clear. We are now being asked to lay down a policy which we should be prepared to accept. In reply to this request I would say, "In vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird. Do you make a proposition to us, when you are in a position to attempt to carry it into law, and we will then tell you whether we will accept it or not."

And this brings me to the question of the so-

called "special treatment." Hitherto we have made common cause with the Anglicans and the Wesleyans, but in view of recent developments it seems to be doubtful whether this policy will be open to us for any very great length of time. As far as the Wesleyans are concerned, it would appear that a large number at least of that body are prepared to give up the policy of separate schools, so that if this should turn out to be the case we can no longer count upon their support or assistance.

The Anglican Position.

Then we come to the Anglican position. It has always seemed to me that our relations with them, whilst no doubt of advantage to the cause of religious education at large, have had at least this one disadvantage—that they have led persons to imagine that our positions were identical. This is very far from being the case. In the eyes of the overwhelming majority of the inhabitants of this country the Church of England is one of several, I might say many, Protestant bodies in this land, and to the careless observer it is not very easy to see why all such bodies cannot combine on some common modicum of religious instruction. We can see that such a plan would not be acceptable to some Anglicans—to others it would be welcome—and can understand their motives. But what we want made clear to Gallio in the street is that whether this is a possible policy for Anglicans or not, it is not possible for us. We cannot take any part or lot in a common system of religious education, and we are not going

to agree to any scheme which tends to make us do so. I repeat that it is important that our distinct position should be made clear on this head.

Then, again, it is extremely difficult to know what the Church of England does want, if, indeed, it has any clear idea itself. Recently I have seen a letter in the *Times* from the Anglican Dean of Bathurst, New South Wales, extolling the "right of entry" method which prevails in that Colony. This was followed, a day or two later, by another from the Archdeacon of Monmouth, in this island, complaining that such a policy is not possible in this country on account of the refusal of the non-religious party to accept it, and stating that, "it would, I venture to say, meet the views of the majority of Churchmen if a compromise could be brought about on this basis." The Dean of Bathurst ends his letter with the remark: "It is only fair to say that the Church of Rome does not look with favour on this provision, though it gives satisfaction to the rest of the population, secures equal rights to all, and is not a Godless system." For the last fact we may at least express our thankfulness, but the Catholic inhabitants of this country will no more "look with favour" upon this proposition than their brethren in the Antipodes; indeed, they will go further and refuse peacefully to accept any measure which ties them down to this limit.

Now, on the other hand, I can very well see certain advantages which the Anglican Church might gain from such a compromise. It is not for me to argue this aspect of the question, and I am not going to do so, because it is not my place to express an opinion as to what is the proper

policy on the part of the Establishment. What I do want to bring out is that we are coming to a point at which it may be possible for the Anglicans to accept a measure which we could not, and that in that case we should have to depart from our policy of the past, and demand different measures for our children from those with which Anglicans might content themselves. One cannot also conceal from oneself that far too large a proportion of the Anglican laity has no strong convictions on the subject of religious education. I give all honour to those clergy and laity who have done what they have done in the past, and who are now carrying on their schools with a definite religious teaching which, though it is not ours, is at least far better than the stuff which is described as undenominational Christianity. But one is forced regretfully to admit that there is not the same force of lay opinion behind the Anglican demand that there is behind ours, in proportion to the numbers of the two bodies. Poll the Catholic body throughout the land, and you will find it absolutely determined that its children shall be taught the Catholic religion in Catholic schools, and prepared, too, if necessary, to take any needful measures to ensure that this shall be the case. If there were the same unanimity of opinion amongst Anglicans—which is, perhaps, too much to expect—the position of religious education in this country would be much stronger than it is. Let me repeat that we have a somewhat different platform from that of the Anglicans, and that we have a laity which, though numerically much smaller, is much more united and in earnest as to its educational programme.

Rate-Aid and State-Aid.

These are matters of prime importance in the present controversy. It has been suggested by some that the Act should be so modified as to permit any school to opt itself out from under the local authority, to cease to receive any rate-aid and to obtain in lieu thereof an extra capitation grant from the Treasury. From one point of view this would, in my opinion, be an excellent thing. I have never ceased to believe that the paying for any kind of education out of local sources is a gross absurdity. John Bull and Patsy Murphy are not being educated in Birmingham for Birmingham, but for the good of the nation at large, at least so it is hoped and believed. In so far, therefore, such a scheme would have my support. And it would have it in its entirety, if it were the only way by which we could retain the only kind of school which we are prepared to accept or submit to. But I should deeply regret to see such a measure carried, for it would at once take from out of the scheme of national education not only our own but presumably a number of other schools. We have at this moment a great scheme of national education—one which, if fairly worked and administered without religious or irreligious prejudice, might and could accomplish great things, and it would be a thousand pities to see it torn to pieces. But torn to pieces it must be if in no other way we can obtain fair treatment.

It is not our place, however, I submit, to discuss the question, at least in public, of how our demand is to be met. Suffice it that we lay down precisely

what is the minimum which we are prepared to accept, and then leave it to those who are concerned with the drawing up of an amending Bill (I think it may be some time before we see an amending Act) to make such provisions as they see fit. When we see them we shall be able to say whether we can accept them or not. But there is one thing for which the time is more than ripe, and that is the putting of our present schools into proper order and the provision of such new schools, particularly of the secondary group, as we may require. This is a point upon which various writers in *The Tablet*, and particularly my friend Abbot Ford, have most properly insisted. I wish the bulk of our laity could be got to understand how pressing and how great a task this is. It is pressing because at this moment there is a number of our schools which a hostile authority, prepared for any kind of depredations upon the public purse, could practically close, unless large sums of money were forthcoming. How long it may be before some such attempt is made no one can say ; not long, it would appear, in the West Riding, at any rate.

The Need of Money.

And it is great because it entails the raising of a great sum of money. I believe that the estimate of £1,000,000 which has appeared in our papers is not an exaggerated one, and I believe that if we are to save our schools a determined attempt must be made to raise this sum by contributions, large and small. May I add another suggestion, without any intention

of giving offence? It is prompted solely by the very keen interest which I take in this matter of education. I think we should enforce a "self-denying ordinance" and add nothing to our churches, save what is absolutely necessary, until our educational necessities have been relieved. New churches we must have, and repairs and alterations unfortunately cannot be postponed, but I would make a plea that beyond this we should not go, until we have put our educational organization on a proper and sound footing. I must confess—I hope I shall not be thought to be temerarious in saying it—that I never read of an erection of a new high altar, or the putting-up of a new stained-glass window without a pang of regret for the needs of the heavily mortgaged or ill-repaired schools which are our first line of defence. Better to kneel on the bare earth, as many of our forefathers have done in Ireland, and have only painted deal for our altars, than abandon the schools in which the little ones of Christ are brought up in the truths of religion. There can be no matter more pressing and serious than this, and I am certain that it requires no urging upon those who are responsible for our educational policy.

But this is a layman's and a laywoman's question, and I wish I could make my words heard by all of them, and cause them to feel how great is the necessity for us to be up and doing. I am quite prepared to be described as one of the pessimists who are always with us. Well, I hope I may be too pessimistic. With such knowledge as I possess of the educational field I cannot but feel anxious. Anxious, not hopeless, for I feel certain that if we have a definite

policy and an absolute determination at all hazards and at any cost of strife, to have that policy carried out we shall be successful. But let us see to it that we have the policy, the determination, and the sinews of war.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.
U

THE RIGHTS OF MINORITIES[1]

By the Rev. JOSEPH RICKABY, S.J.

Rhetoric and Science

A great master in science has likewise written a book on rhetoric. He lays it down that a scientific argument is drawn from the nature of the facts under consideration, but a rhetorical argument from the nature of the audience to be persuaded, a very different standard to go by. To persuade an audience, you may have to descend to ground which you yourself regard as scientifically untenable, or, at any rate, not tenable without further defences, which you may securely neglect, thanks to the incapacity of the men you have to deal with. That "the audience are a poor lot," *φαῦλοι οἱ ἀκροαταί*, is an axiom, according to Aristotle, of the first importance for the orator to remember. He must not waste rigid demonstrations upon them, but ply them

[1] A paper read at the Catholic Conference, Blackburn, September 27, 1905.

with catchwords that will "go down" and suit their stomachs. The practice of the great Roman orator, Cicero, well illustrates this Aristotelian precept. The Cicero of the Speeches, addressing senate or jury, is a very different man from the Cicero of the Letters, uttering his real mind to his friends.

I say this not with any reference to the intelligent audience now before me, but with regard to a wider audience, the British public. In their judgement upon questions where religion comes in, the British public, I fear, are on the whole "a poor lot," steeped in ignorance, prejudice, heresy and indifferentism, dreading and disliking whatever savours of Rome. At such disadvantage, before such a tribunal, do we plead Roman Catholic claims in the matter of education. What shall we, a poor minority, say to the mighty mass of our countrymen? Shall we tell them that the Catholic Church is the Kingdom of the Word Incarnate? that she bears His royal commission to teach all nations, but most especially those who are of the household of the faith? that dire woe is pronounced from heaven upon all who set stumbling-blocks in the way of little ones who believe in Christ—aye, upon the nation, however great and powerful, that so legislates as to render the bringing up of Catholic children in the Catholic faith a working impossibility? These things are true; these are the facts which the scientific eye of the Catholic believer regards, and upon which his educational policy is based.

But the unbelieving and, consequently, in the things of God, unscientific eye of millions of our countrymen is blind to this really decisive aspect of the education question. We are left in the position of a son who holds a document which he well knows to represent the last will of his father, but which from some technical defect of signature cannot be pleaded in court. We cannot plead before the British public that the Catholic Church is the one true Church of Christ, and that Christ is God, and that God is Lord of all, of States no less than of individuals. We are obliged to descend to lower and less scientific ground. We have to acquiesce, for argument's sake, in the supposition that one religion is as good as another, so that it be not inimical to the interests of the State. We have to argue upon the axiom, generally admitted, that consciences are not be interfered with, except when by some abnormal perversion they come to stand in the way of the decency and order and proper requirements of civil society. And we add that the Catholic conscience, surely as reputable an organ as the Nonconformist conscience, cannot endure to see Catholic children driven into schools where everything that a Catholic values as distinctively Catholic is ignored, tacitly set aside, nay, lies open to downright mockery and formal repudiation. The Nonconformists filled all England with their outcries at the iniquity of having to send their children to Church of England schools in

places where they had failed to build schools of their own. If they had built schools of their own, and a majority of voters, being strong Church of England men, had refused all aid to these Nonconformist schools unless they came under Church of England management and were taught by Church of England teachers, one may imagine how the new temple of Nonconformity that is being erected on the site of the old Westminster Aquarium would have rung with indignant complaint, and how "passive resisters" would have multiplied in the land.

Yet that is the exact counterpart of the situation that our Nonconformist brethren are endeavouring to create for us. We are threatened with an endowment of Nonconformity, "the Nonconformist on the rates," and not a mere endowment but a monopoly. The schools which we Catholics have erected out of Catholic money, saving cost to the ratepayers, in the hopes of the continuance of that well-earned subvention from public funds which alone renders the maintenance of such schools possible, will have to be closed for defect of such maintenance unless we are prepared to surrender them to a purpose the very opposite of that for which they were built. And the justification pleaded for this arbitrary proceeding is the will of the majority. We Catholics are a minority, and we are poor, and therefore we must submit to be hustled and flouted in our dearest interests by the mass of our countrymen as were the

Jews in Egypt by the mass of the Egyptians till Moses led them forth. We are not going to secede, but we may well try to persuade our country to treat us better.

Ends of Education

To bring two parties to an agreement or compromise it is useful to specify what ends they severally wish to gain, and upon such specification to consider whether those several ends are incompatible one with another. The end and aim of the Catholic body in all its contention about education is simply this, that the children of Catholic parents may be brought up Catholics. There are those in this land and in every land, France for example, who regard the Catholic faith as a detestable superstition, as the Roman Emperors Decius and Diocletian regarded Christianity. They call for its extirpation at any price. They find the axe, the rack, the wild beasts of the arena unnecessary instruments for their purpose, and gone somewhat out of fashion. They will do to Catholicism what the Church has sometimes done to a religious community that it wished to suppress, forbidding it to receive novices; they will weight education with public money, and lay the balance so cunningly that Catholic schools shall heel over and founder, and the Catholic child, the novice, I may call him, of the Catholic Church, in the poorer classes at any rate, shall gradually become an impossibility. With men who con-

sciously labour to this end, it is useless to argue; we can only expose their purpose and put them to shame. They are endeavouring to subvert that principle of freedom of conscience in religious beliefs, upon which the British Empire has been governed for a century. They are making the State what the State never can be, judge of religion. The State can only be judge of public order and tranquillity.

Happily, these our heartiest, our thorough-going opponents, are themseives a minority in the land. We are, I dare say, quite as numerous as they. It remains to inquire what the mass of English folk hope to get as the reward of the money that they are spending and prepared to spend on education, as the product of imperial and municipal care and control of schools. I have thought of four ends contemplated and desired in this light. I state them, not in any order of desire or desirability, but as they have occurred to my mind. The first end then is Empire, the second is trade, the third is public health, the fourth is social virtue. If we can convince our countrymen that what we demand on behalf of Catholic schools does not militate against any of these ends, which the State has in view in its care for education; if we show readiness heartily to concur in the prosecution of these four ends; if we insist that we Catholics have in our mind's eye a perfectly compatible fifth end, namely, the theoretical and practical training of our own children in the faith of

their parents, then the refusal of our demands may be seen to be unreasonable, and therefore—in a government set up for the good, the ease, the content of all its subjects—a refusal tyrannical and unjust.

I will not weary your patience with arguing that the preservation of Catholic schools is no danger to the British Empire, that we are not disloyal: that we shall place no hindrance to that education of our working classes which is deemed necessary for the products of British manufacture to hold their own in the market against the competition of educated nations on the Continent, say Germany; that we Catholics have no affection for sewer-gas, and are not, as a body, opposed to vaccination; that we are lovers of washing, fresh-air and exercise, and are eager to exterminate the deadly microbe according as science shows us the game; lastly, that we have a modest confidence in our ability to teach social virtue, or, in other words, such honesty, self-restraint and good manners, as are necessary to prevent the world being turned into a bear-garden. By all means let us promise, while inculcating that higher virtue which fits men for another world, not to be negligent of the virtue the absence of which unfits them for this. Possibly, looking at drunkenness and other evils within our fold, we may confess in all humility some failure of educational success on some of these points. If so, we must amend that deficiency. The sobriety, industry, public spirit, and sound frames of the children

who come forth from our Catholic schools, will go further than anything else to convince our countrymen that Catholic education should be respected and deserves to live.

The Lesson of Passive Resistance

It is difficult to argue the justice of Catholic claims in education without setting forth in particular what Catholics do claim in our present educational crisis. On the other hand, to formulate these claims is beyond the function, not to say beyond the capacity, of the present writer. I must be allowed to do what I cannot help doing, to speak somewhat vaguely and deficiently and inadequately. The statement of our claims in all their amplitude I leave to others: I will state some part of our just claim. And in stating it I will be mindful of the Aristotelian distinction between science and rhetoric—between claims sound in themselves and claims that you can press with effect before a popular jury; in other words, between what we simply ought to have, and what we at once ought to have and are not unlikely to get. In considering these "rhetorically valid" claims, as I may call them, I am apt to think that our friends the "passive resisters" have taught us a useful lesson and created a valuable precedent in our favour. I am not at all in favour of the policy of refusing to pay our education rates, however much we may dislike and detest the

purpose to which we know they will be applied. By all means let us pay our rates, and give an example of Catholic obedience in contrast with Nonconformist disobedience to law. It is the principle, not the practice of the Nonconformists that is valuable to us. The principle is this, that it is undesirable for ratepayers to have to pay for schools that they do not want and object to use. Now we Catholics do not want secularist schools, and object to our children going there. Further, what the Nonconformists generally have not done, we have provided schools at our own heavy cost. One claim, then, that we might make, though it does not belong to me to make it, a claim which no passive resister ought to dispute, is to be exempted from paying rates to secularist, or what are called "provided" schools, on this condition—that whatever education rate be levied in the locality where we live we pay that same rate, thus bearing our fair share of public burdens; and that our contribution be "earmarked" and assigned to the support of Catholic schools. A Catholic school may be defined, so far as elementary schools go, as "a school taught by Catholic teachers." If this claim were allowed, we should at least save our education rates for our own purposes, and not pay education rates for an education which is to us polluted water, which our lips refuse to touch. Whether our own education rates would suffice to keep our schools, that is another question not belonging to my subject. The answer

would be various in various localities according to the various number of Catholics in each. Some equality would be found by pooling over large areas. But let that question pass. We should have to settle it amongst ourselves.

Can we urge any further claim upon the justice of our countrymen? I think we can. But before proceeding to do so, I should like to fix a mark in advance, a sort of statute of limitations, beyond which our claims need not be pressed. It is well to reassure our judges beforehand upon the modesty of our pretensions. Supposing, then, it were laid down that Catholics had no right to expect the burden of public taxation to be increased for the easing of their consciences. That principle, rigidly carried out, would bear heavily upon our body, and would deprive us of many privileges that we now enjoy.

Justice or Generosity

Economists might point out that one chaplain ought to suffice for the needs of so many hundred soldiers, or so many score of workhouse inmates, prisoners, or patients. They might prescribe the appointment of one Anglican clergyman accordingly, regardless of the fact that one-third of the said soldiers, or patients, were Catholics, to whom the reverend gentleman's services would be entirely nugatory, and who, consequently, in

practice would have no chaplain at all. We are better treated than that; and for such better treatment we have to thank a good quality in our fellow-countrymen, concerning which I am here wholly indifferent whether it should be called "generosity" or "justice." We should be amply satisfied if we could secure similar justice, or generosity, in the matter of elementary education. For consider. The State has taken upon itself to see that all its people shall be educated. The rich it leaves to their parents, presuming that no well-to-do father or mother will allow a child of theirs to grow up wholly illiterate and boorish. The poor, too often, are unable or unwilling to pay for the education of their children. Thereupon the State, or rather, under the State, the municipality or commune, builds schools, staffs and furnishes them at public expense, and by authority sweeps all otherwise unprovided children into those schools. Considering our whole number, the percentage of Catholic poor is extraordinarily large. Taken together, we are a flock of poor people. And we have precisely the same rights as other citizens. What Government does for others, it ought to do for us. We are neither proscribed nor pariahs in the land. Suppose not a penny had been raised for Catholic elementary education, and no Catholic elementary school existed anywhere in England, all our poorer Catholic children would be thrown on the public funds. I have no statistics of the number by me, but it is a large number,

and their schooling would cost the country a considerable sum. I presume I may further hope and suppose that of our existing Catholic schools the legal titles of ownership are so secure in private hands that not one of them could be claimed by public authority as its property. We could, if we chose, sell all those premises for music-halls, or art galleries, or even public-houses: and none of the money so realized would belong to county council or other State educational authority. Thereupon we might demand of the Secularist party a raising of rates all round for the Secularist education of Catholic children. That would be, in some towns especially, a pretty bill to pay. No doubt, part of it is already paid in the shape of grants to Catholic schools, and salaries to Catholic teachers. But such payment is only partial. There remains a large unpaid amount. That sum represents the gain hitherto made by the public purse from the educational charity of Catholics, from the charity of the poorest class in the community. One would like to know, in this matter of elementary schooling, how much the public purse is indebted to the voluntary contributions of the prosperous Nonconformist tradesman, the Wesleyan and Jewish communities always excepted. When then it is urged that Catholic claims for elementary education involve expenditure of public money upon Catholic schools, we may reply that surely public money ought to be expended upon Catholic children, as much as upon any other children,

and, if anything, more, seeing that Catholic children are poorer and needier than other children : further, that this expenditure should in reason take such a form as may be acceptable to Catholic parents, and not present to them for bread what to their stomachs is a stone : lastly, that the money which Catholic children would cost, were their entire education thrown upon rates and taxes, as in all justice it might be—that this sum, I say, would amply suffice to cover the entire expenditure which Catholics are now demanding of public authority for the support of an education distinctively Catholic. Thus for education we are keeping within the maxim, otherwise, as I have said, a rigid and stern maxim, and one already set aside in our favour in other departments, that the safeguarding of the Catholic conscience ought not to increase the financial burdens of the State.

It is not within my province, nor within my purpose either, to deal with the rule continually quoted against us, that public money involves public control. Public money, as our opponents are always telling us, is given for secular education. We too undertake to provide secular education ; and for all the details of that secular education, for which alone public money is given, we challenge the most unlimited public control. We do not take away from education, but we add. We add one whole subject, religious Catholic education ; and that subject we claim to have taught in our own way, not in other men's way who do not understand it. Our educa-

tion is secular, but not secularist: that is to say, it is not exclusive of those three articles of the Christian creed, God, Jesus Christ, and the life of the world to come. We contend that our children will not grow up less worthy and less efficient citizens of this world for being trained over and above that in the duties of a citizenship that is in heaven. I am aware that M. Combes and the Grand Orient Lodge think otherwise. But are they really Liberal? Are they a model for English politicians?

A General Principle

The general question of the rights of minorities in a democratic State makes a nice point of political science. It seems clear that in foreign relations the State must behave as one person: a minority cannot be permitted to levy war on a foreign Power with whom the State as a whole is at peace, nor to remain at peace and refuse to serve against a Power, with whom the State is at war. Nor must a minority create such disturbance as to render the will of the majority nugatory in what concerns the said majority. Thus if the will of the majority is to have "provided schools," in which no dogmatic religion shall be taught, Catholics are in no position to interfere with the erection of such schools. Let the schools be "provided" at the public expense, and let the children of the parents who approve of them go there. Catholics

ask for nothing that could in any way do injury to such schools. Any lover of free trade and fair play, any man who grievously suspects protectionism, monopolies and syndicates, ought, one would think, in this question of education, to feel some sympathy for Catholics.

On the general question I have written elsewhere in a Dissertation stamped with an approval that I highly value: "Besides the proper and essential functions of civil authority, functions necessary to the conservation of any maturely organized political society, there are other functions postulated by public convenience, which government, imperial or local, may take up, if the people by general consent will have it so. This may be called the Principle of Voluntary Public Control. It goes towards clearing up the difficulty which we all feel in fixing the exact bounds of civil authority, what the State may do and what it may not do in the way of abridging the liberty of the individual. State interference can have no *legal* limits, inasmuch as the State makes the law: only physical and moral limits. It is more important to assert the existence of such limits than to trace them as though one were a member of a boundary commission. The principle of voluntary public control has this advantage, that it is not too rigid for facts and futurities. According to this principle, there is an inferior and a superior limit to civil authority; I mean, there is a minimum of civil authority which the maturely developed State can never forego, and there is a maximum which the same State

can never exceed, it being the utmost fulness of power which any State can ever carry. Between these two limits civil authority is just what the people as a whole wills that it shall be. The State thus becomes the organ of public opinion. There is a clear trend of public opinion to widen further and further still the region of control." To which text the following note is appended: "But in spontaneous admissions of State interference, *e.g.*, in the matter of education, special regard should be had for the rights of minorities, where there is a strong minority against interference and tenacious of their liberty" (*Political and Moral Essays*, pp. 69–71, Dissertation on the *Origin and Extent of Civil Authority*. Benziger, 1902).

Whenever there is opportunity of exercising their civil rights, the Catholic minority should show itself "strong" and "tenacious" on this point of education. It should know its own mind and voice the same loudly, and enforce it in political and municipal action. A minority that does not cry aloud almost to shrieking pitch, will not be heard for the roar of greater numbers. Above all, the Catholic minority must be united on this one issue. A disunited minority is a nonentity: it has neither cohesion nor force nor available rights.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.

RELIGIOUS INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOLS

By ROBERT J. SMYTHE

The present trend of educational politics removes the occasion for prefatory apology in any attempt to simplify the problem of securing religious instruction to the children. In a very literal sense "the old order changeth," and even the most sanguine look uneasily to the development. Amid hopes and fears one thing seems certain: the bulk of the religious instruction and the responsibility for it cannot be placed as heretofore with the teachers. Their earnestness and goodwill may remain, but they will be of little avail when effort and desire are restricted and fenced in by the regulations of a rigid governing authority.

A gradual weakening of the Catholic position in the matter of religious training became inevitable by the Act of 1902. In a letter addressed to the clergy and laity the late Cardinal Vaughan thus wrote: "As a result of that Act competition between the world and the Church to control the formation of the young has become visibly and sensibly accentuated in all directions." And to counterbalance "the increasing control

of the world in the sphere of education to the ultimate destruction of revealed religion as a vital factor in public and private life," he advocated everywhere an introduction or extension of Confraternities of Christian Doctrine, whose special function is to co-operate with the clergy in the religious instruction of the young.

Infinitely more hostile to Catholic interests is the prospective Act than the Act of 1902, and, while in many districts it may be sufficient to strengthen and supplement existing means of instruction, in some districts at least the whole work of religious instruction may need to be organized and carried on apart from the ordinary routine of the day-school.

In considering any scheme of voluntary effort for teaching purposes, a grave difficulty confronts us at the outset. No subject lends itself more readily than education to discussions of a general character: few subjects are less fruitful and more distressing to the tyro than teaching. The reason of this is plain. Teaching is an art—it is practical. It conforms in its operations to general principles, as do all arts; yet good teaching is no more inevitably the outcome of an acquaintance with the broad features of educational science, than is the ability to write good poetry a necessary outcome of a knowledge of the principles of versification.

Good teaching implies learning, love of knowledge, patience, zeal: the converse of the proposition is of limited application only. A widespread appreciation of this fact is no doubt an explanation of the general practice of leaving religious instruction equally with secular instruction, almost wholly in the hands of

professional educators. But while it is true that a wide range of good gifts directed by use are involved in the work of teaching, and that the perfect craftsman is as rarely met with in the school as in the atelier, it is equally true that fair proficiency in the art is within reach of all.

In this paper it is proposed, first, to consider certain aspects of the course of religious instruction usually followed, with a view to a possible simplification ; and, secondly, to set down briefly some of the more obvious conditions of successful oral teaching for the consideration of those who are without actual experience of the work, but who may be disposed if need be to do their best in it for the children's sake.

I.

The range of matter for lessons is so extensive and the time at disposal so short, that the loss is serious where the academic is preferred to the practical, the formal to the real. And it is obvious that in applying the terms just used, a constant adjustment must take place.

Selection of matter will depend on (i.) the importance of the information in itself, (ii.) its suitability to the age, capacity, and circumstances of the children. A careful overhauling of values will show how effort may be economized. As an example : One of the diocesan syllabuses used to prescribe as part of the memory-work for individual repetition the Hymns to the Holy Ghost, the Hymn of St. Bernard, the Litany of our Lady, the *Miserere* Psalm, and the *Te Deum!* The

exercise was unnecessary ; it took up much valuable time ; it was irksome ; yet—so easily do we adapt ourselves to what is—several generations of school-children were made to pass through the ordeal ere a reasonable change was effected.

In framing schemes and in selecting material for lessons the keynote is simplicity. In case of doubt it is well to err on the side of defect, for an overcharged syllabus induces cram and lessens the disposition to take up the instruction for its own sake as a labour of love. The amount of religious knowledge absolutely necessary for children is small : it will, if the treatment be good, produce in later life choice fruit in faith and character. But the issue is obscured and development is arrested when the essential is overlaid with what is at the best of but secondary importance.

In the forefront of most schemes of religious instruction stands the Catechism, and the position has been held so long that there is a tendency to admit a prescriptive right to it. There are some to whom Catechism, learning, and religious instruction are synonymous terms. To these any suggestion of a modified use of the Catechism may come as a painful surprise. They will recall their young days spent in Catechism lessons and point to a manhood of lusty Catholicity, and into a time sequence read cause and effect. Or they may maintain not less bravely that, since the Catechism is an excellent epitome of religious knowledge, therefore the teaching of the Catechism must be an excellent means of conveying religious knowledge.

In days gone by there was little need to traverse

these or other arguments, on which was founded a conviction of the supreme need of mastering as early as possible the whole text of the Catechism, for a wide margin of time was still available for more intimate instruction. But those who are acquainted with the actual conditions of work inside the schools see clearly in the near future—whatever the letter of the law may be—a considerable curtailment of the study and observance of religion.

Let us look into the question more closely. The qualities which give value to the Catechism as a compendium of Christian Doctrine—the completeness of its survey, the precision of its definitions, the logical arrangement of its parts—recommend it but slightly as a text-book for the young. Fulness of matter is without advantage where only a small portion of the whole can be studied ; definition, however exact, is usually of less value to children than simple description ; and the psychology of the child disposes us to regard as futile the attempt to build up for him an elaborate system on a strictly logical basis.

The Catechism is ungraded in respect either of importance of contents or of difficulty of matter. Much of the earlier sections is pure theology, of little practical use to the child. The two chapters which are most easily intelligible—those dealing with the Christian's Rule of Life and the Christian's Daily Exercise—come last, and are reached, if at all, at the close of a child's school career. It would be amusing, were the question of religious instruction of less moment, to contemplate the position of the seven-year-old child on his transference from the infant department to the senior school.

He is able, with assistance, to read words of one syllable and to understand their meaning vaguely ; he can just catch a glimpse of number in the concrete ; he writes a little, and he may be able to take an interest in a simple tale, provided it be within his sphere of thought and well told. With such preliminary training he is set upon the Catechism, and in a short time can repeat glibly enough that "Faith is a supernatural gift of God which enables us to believe without doubting whatever God has revealed" ; that "We must believe whatever God has revealed, because God is the very Truth who can neither deceive nor be deceived" ; that, "God is the Supreme Spirit who alone exists of Himself and is infinite in all perfections" ; and that "A mystery is a truth which is above reason but revealed by God."

In days gone by catechism-learning was much in vogue. There were catechisms of history, of common knowledge, of natural science, of philosophy, and specimens may still be found in the lumber-rooms of old houses, or on the shelves of amateurs in literary curiosities. But all these manuals have vanished from the schools. It is generally held to be unnecessary and undesirable to reduce our information on a subject to a congeries of definitions. And to approach a study by means of definitions is to run counter to all the principles of scientific method. What then must be said of the teaching of such definitions as those instanced to children of tender years? The teacher is yet unborn who could give them life and meaning. We may manufacture, so to speak, infant gramophones which on the application of due stimulus will tickle our ears

with a record intelligible to ourselves ; but the instruments will remain dull, cold, and unchanged.

The question may be viewed from another standpoint, and the acquisition of Catechism answers in childhood considered as capital for later years. This is ordinarily the view of those who by the condition of their life and occupation need frequently to refresh their knowledge of the Catechism. But we have to consider the case of the every-day child who satisfies the demands of the Diocesan Inspector, and passes from the schoolroom to the shop, the factory, or the fields. What is the influence of the imperfectly comprehended exercises of childhood during the perilous years of adolescence ? And how much of the original does the memory retain at a period when wider experience and maturer judgement would render it of value ? For an answer to the last question the reader may make a direct examination in typical cases. Or, without leaving his arm-chair, let him endeavour to write out the paradigms of some language learnt at school and since neglected. Then, having made a deduction in his own case for the influence of favourable circumstances and a cultured mind, he may look upon the residue as a fair standard of comparison.

In spite of the drawbacks and limitations inseparable from this form of study, there is so much convenience to the teacher in having to hand a *précis* of Christian Doctrine, and so much advantage in the general adoption of an authorized expression of religious knowledge and belief, that there is little likelihood of the Catechism ceasing to occupy a central position in the scheme of religious instruction. But it is of the first importance to ascertain how its study may be made less

routinary and its influence more real. Here suggestions arise. Selected portions of the Catechism of practical utility and allowing of explanation to young children might be studied first, and the more abstract portions left over. Or a shorter and simpler Catechism might be prepared for the elementary school, and the manual at present in use be reserved for more advanced pupils. There is little need, however, to discuss details now: they will assume a practical form should a modification of the present course be seen to be desirable. Meanwhile, we may bear in mind that our aim is to teach the most and the best and that we are not teaching in Utopia.

Let us turn from this branch of religious instruction in schools and ask if values are sufficiently weighed in the department of Scripture History. Here the arrangement of matter is usually chronological. The seven-year-old child begins with the Creation, and within a period of, perhaps, twelve months he reaches, say, the Tower of Babel; within another period he may come to the Captivity in Egypt; and, again, he wanders through the Desert to the Promised Land. By dint of custom this procedure is followed without a suspicion of incongruity, and children will learn to reel off the order of Creation, the names of the sons of Jacob and the plagues of Egypt without hesitation or danger of transposition.

We do not set about the teaching of English history in this crude way. First are taught simple stories of bravery, of duty, of unselfishness, of obedience, which make a direct appeal to the child—stories of the Lion-Heart, of Nelson, of the burghers of Calais, of the Black

Prince ; then come salient features of history traced simply through cause and effect ; these again are expanded and worked out in detail ; and, lastly, if opportunity offer, there is specialization of a given period. We do not trouble young minds with the complexities of the Saxon Heptarchy, with the Treaty of Dover, or the Constitutions of Clarendon. Might not the same young minds be as considerately dealt with in the teaching of Holy Writ ?

Instruction in the New Testament leaves little room for comment. The parts usually taught in school are within the capacity of children, and of direct value. But there is a tendency even here to subordinate spirit to letter—to reduce, for instance, the teaching of parables to rote, and their lessons to bald statements.

A pertinent consideration comes in here. In every branch of secular instruction there have been made during recent years strenuous efforts not only to popularize the study by a clear and convincing presentation of its main features, but there have been equally strenuous attempts to elaborate special methods of teaching the various subjects. For although common principles of method can be seen to underlie all good teaching, the application of these principles is infinitely varied, and distinctive methods are evolved in harmony with the subject-matter and with the special purposes which a subject is meant to serve. And much good, direct and incidental, has resulted to various branches of school-work from this elaboration of method. In religious instruction, however, little seems to have been done ; we are where we were years ago, and the special didactics of the subject have hardly been begun.

Some of the defects in the religious instruction of the schools are traceable to the system of inspection which has been commonly adopted. The courses of study prescribed have been extensive, the tests have been stringent, and schools have been classified according to their examination results. Under such conditions there is small room for surprise if, too often, the teacher has lost perspective and devoted his attention to the word rather than the thing. For some unaccountable reason the inspections have been originally modelled on the lines of the inspectors of the Education Department during the period when school-payments were made according to "result." But whereas in secular subjects a constant endeavour has been made to get away from the ill-effects which that form of inspection produced, many of its evil features are still recognizable in the Department of Religious Instruction.

II.

It has been said that an initial difficulty of all organizations of voluntary effort for purposes of instruction lies in the nature of the work. For though good-will and zeal, joined with adequate knowledge of the subject-matter, will go far, they cannot of themselves suffice in an undertaking which demands a measure of technical ability. A few simple observations on some of the more obvious principles and conditions common to all successful teaching are here submitted. They may, perhaps, tend to direct effort along lines which might otherwise be overlooked or ignored, and thus be of service to those who are taking up the task of teaching for the first time.

Lecturing and Teaching.

The beginner is more apt to lecture than to teach. The two exercises are not wholly dissimilar, inasmuch as each makes a demand upon clear statement and vivid narration. In other respects they are at opposite poles. With the lecturer the question is, "How much matter can be presented?" with the teacher, "How much may be taught?" The lecturer obtrudes information; the teacher seeks to create a demand for it. The lecturer is concerned with his own point of view; the teacher with the point of view of his pupils. The lecturer assumes intelligence, desire, concentration, receptivity: the teacher has to ascertain if these qualities exist, and to what degree, and no small part of his effort lies in inducing, stimulating, and developing these primary conditions of learning.

Lecturing is not altogether out of place in school. With older children and in subjects which are well within their range of thought, it may be advantageously used. With young children it is of small value, for the well-ordered information of the adult finds little response among the fragmentary shreds of knowledge possessed by the child. It is just here that the teacher comes in. He brings his mind to meet the mind of his pupils. There is fusion of idea, feeling, sentiment. And not for a moment does he lose sight of the fact that if the information he means to supply is to be more than empty words, it must in some way or other be brought into connection with knowledge which already exists, so that the child may recognize in the new matter an expansion or development of his previous

store. This seems to be the true meaning of the much-quoted and ill-used aphorism of method, "Proceed from the known to the unknown."

Questioning.

In order to ascertain the content of the pupil's mind the teacher resorts to questions—often with but slight success. For owing to difference in concept and in sentiment between the child and the adult a question and its interpretation may be in spheres of thought which are mutually exclusive. A sympathetic teacher who knows how to keep himself in the background is usually not long in finding some idea in common, and then he has only to follow the lead of his pupils to maintain touch with them. Of special value to him are the questions which children under genial treatment are wont to ask, and the explanations and narrations which they delight to make.

The alertness and industry of the pupils show clearly when they are interested in the lesson, and the interest will continue so long as the instruction is within the range of their thought, and their activity is stimulated by constant addition of new matter intimately allied with what has been already assimilated.

There is no need here to treat of the questions employed to test the remembrance of facts, for such questioning lies outside the lesson proper. Nor need we dwell on that most difficult form of questioning to which the name Socratic is often given, in which, by skilfully applied questions, the pupil is made to shift voluntarily from position to position, until at last he himself rises to the formulation of the truth which is

under discussion. Such questioning is obviously of use to the teacher of ability only, and is a very perfect example of progression from the known to the unknown. But reference may be made to a common practice of interlarding a narrative with points of interrogation which lead nowhere and elucidate nothing, and serve no other purpose save to disguise thinly a lecture under the trappings of a lesson.

Aim and Method.

How often does the schoolboy marvel at what seems to him the special facility of the teacher in disguising his meaning! Each lead has a blind issue, and the web becomes more tangled as the lesson advances. In such lessons the facts are usually correct, but they are used, so far as the class is concerned, in the wrong place. Such misplacement, with its attendant confusion of thought, would be avoided were the teacher to fix in advance his aim and keep it in mind throughout the lesson. Changes need to be made in his preconceived procedure to suit the circumstances which arise during the instruction, and indeed the soul of good teaching is spontaneity. But every change of procedure must serve to bring out more clearly the dominant idea.

This conscious adaptation of means to end is the basis of method, without which teaching is unworthy of the name. And it should seem that method may be impaired by either of two opposite faults. The teacher may keep changing front, in which case the pupils are unable to fix, out of many possible, the goal at which they should aim. Or, he may persevere in his course

without taking care that his pupils are given sufficient guidance to enable them to bear him company.

Interest.

Learning proceeds through interest. When the pupils become genuinely interested in the instruction a teacher's difficulties are almost at an end. He need no longer struggle against the resistance of the child-mind to his ministrations. On the contrary, a demand for information comes from the pupils, and this information they endeavour of themselves to systematize. And as the mental effort is at such times highly concentrated, the facts of the lesson become fixed in memory more effectively than they would be by any mere verbal repetition.

All children are not, of course, equally interested in the same things, and some allowance must be made for individual tastes, preferences, and capabilities. The differences in individuals are repeated in a milder form in classes. Instruction which is suitable to the children of a town school may not appeal to children in a remote village. The bases of interest in girls are not identical with those in boys. Nevertheless, in all cases the sum of agreements in essentials outweighs the differences—were it not so, collective teaching would be impossible.

Whatever the conditions and circumstances of the children may be, there is in every lesson a spirit of interest if the teacher will but distil it out. That he fails to do so lies most commonly in his disinclination or inability to come down from his rostrum, to lay aside the cloak of manhood and to be once more a child. The acquisitions of advancing years are not all

clear profit. We accumulate fact, perfect inference, and build up system, but in doing so are apt to lose fancy, imagination, and impulse. This loss a teacher must endeavour to repair, for success depends not upon his wealth of fact, the closeness of his reasoning, the completeness of his knowledge, but upon his power of thinking and feeling as children think and feel. It is not a question of whittling down information, as some do, but of selecting elements which are within the capacity of the child, and presenting them in such a way as to be both intelligible and stimulating.

It is because the child lives in a world of fancy where the facts of life have an aspect and meaning peculiar to the stage of his development that fables and allegories are of such service to the teacher in dealing with junior classes, and it is because of their revolt against the prosaic that children of all ages accept lessons for their daily conduct in the form of stories. Suitable stories may be met with on every side, and, above all, in the pages of Sacred Scripture the teacher has material for concrete illustration of every phase of childhood. But the stories should convey their own lesson if they are to produce the full charm and effect.

An objection may be raised that it is possible to make learning too pleasant, that rigidity in school is a good preparation for the routine of life, and that children should be accustomed to look on their tasks less as a pleasure than as an unavoidable duty. Such objection can only arise from those who regard character as formed by accretions from without rather than by development from within. There is practical unan-

imity among educators that even in the teaching of secular subjects it matters less what we teach than how we teach. The facts taught in school can form only a tiny portion of the sum of knowledge in any direction, and such facts may be forgotten or uncalled for. But in the act of their sympathetic and intelligent study qualities of mind and heart are engendered which persist to the end. The objection is, however, without force for another reason. There is no royal road to learning. With every effort of the teacher obstacles remain. But obstacles are surmounted more easily by those whose interest has been secured and whose intelligence has been evoked. And memorizing is no longer drudgery when motived not only by cheerfully accepted duty but also by the knowledge that it is a means to a desirable end.

Control.

The golden rule for maintaining order in class is to keep the pupils occupied. But this rule is of application only where a measure of disciplinary power already exists. And attention of a mechanical kind which embraces silence and a respectful attitude must be established as a necessary preliminary to the stage of intellectual attention. The non-professional teacher endeavours frequently to obtain a leverage by introducing a story or some other detail calculated to arrest the attention of his class. The principle is excellent, but it does not always work well in practice ; for, unless the instruction is developed easily and intimately, the end of the introductory matter is marked by indifference and reaction.

It is really not difficult to secure initial attention if the teacher assumes in a simple, unpretentious manner his own position and the co-operation of his class. He will do well to avoid a concessive attitude either at the religious lesson or at any other time. Exercise of power is an instinct in children, and under a weak government they tend to become lawless.[1] On the other hand, they are not given to question captiously authority, and their admiration for the strong and masterful makes them willing subjects of an unobtrusive yet determined ruler. A capable teacher bears this in mind in the discipline of his class. He uses few words, he imposes few rules, he neither promises nor threatens, he is firm yet kind. He does not expect too much from his pupils, but he insists on a minimum : he allows for the weaknesses of child-nature while taking advantage of its virtues.

.

The foregoing observations may perhaps serve as a slight introduction to the meaning of method in teaching. Incidentally they may show that teaching is no mere routinary avocation but one in which exceptional demands are made upon the intelligence, the devotion, the knowledge, and the resource of those engaged in it. The progress which has been made in secular studies during recent years is largely the result of improved methods of teaching, and there seems to be no reason to doubt that progress in religious knowledge must be similarly conditioned.

Here we put in a plea for a more general reading of

[1] There seems to be here an explanation of the fate of many a boys' club, guild, and confraternity.

educational science. An inquiry into its principles and their application will be found to open out a new and fertile field of thought. Nor will the study be devoid of immediate utility. At every turn the tax-payer is confronted with the ideals of correlation, unification, nationalization of education—brave words which may mean something or may be but "vacant chaff well-meant for grain." A study of principles will help to show what he is paying for and whereto he is tending. Parents will be especially benefited by such reading, for in it is much that will help them in the management, the training, and the destination of their children. The introduction of a short course of theoretical and practical teaching may be found practicable eventually in all ecclesiastical seminaries. Such a course would be highly stimulating and of no small service to young priests in taking up work on the mission.

This brings us back to our starting-point. The whole work of religious instruction may in the near future need to be organized outside the school, and it is well to look at the special difficulties of the impending task and to be prepared to cope with them.

Inducements to join in the good work are many and profound, and all who enter upon it in the right way may rest assured their labour will not be in vain. In striving to enlighten others, their own vision will be made more clear. Their nature will be deeply moved, and the best that is in them will come forth in communion with the unspoiled souls of children. In watching the growth of the germs of faith and piety which they are privileged to tend, they will find an absorbing interest, and in the affection of their pupils

abiding solace. Their reward even here is great, and a greater is promised hereafter.

III.

In times of impending stress there is ever a tendency to mistake the import of innovation, and it is thus somewhat unfortunate that the outline of a possible modification of the scope and method of religious instruction of the young should need to come under discussion at a moment when our school system itself is seen to be upon a precarious footing. Yet, inasmuch as the trend of events in the elementary school is unmistakable, and by means direct or indirect, motived or unmotived, the portion of the school programme effectively devoted to religion will become inevitably smaller, a discussion is more easily focussed on the necessarily-practical as against the possibly-desirable-but-unobtainable.

A first question arises as to the amount and kind of religious instruction which at present obtains in the schools. To this question no definite answer can be given. The work of a school in this subject depends largely upon the syllabus of the diocese in which the school is situated. A perusal of a number of these syllabuses shows in every case a provision for the learning by heart of prayers, hymns, and catechism, for an explanation of doctrine, and for a knowledge of the Scriptures. But when we come to look at the matter which is detailed, we find—except in the case of the Catechism, which is everywhere prescribed in its entirety —very varied estimates of what is considered desirable for children to know and possible for them to learn.

In one place the commonest prayers only are asked

for, in another are added forms, which from their difficulty, or from the fact that they are meant only for occasional use, might well be sought for, when needed, in a manual of devotion. The requirements in Bible history vary greatly. To take the Old Testament, for example : in one case the instruction is to cover the period from the Creation to Josue, in another case it is to be continued to Solomon, and in a third a knowledge of the whole book is required. In the matter of doctrine the variation is not less marked, ranging as it does from simple courses embracing merely the common truths of faith and the ordinary practices of piety to elaborate schemes which might almost stand as synopses of a complete course in dogma.

It is admittedly a difficult matter to find the normal child for whom these programmes of instruction are framed, and local circumstances, such as irregularity of attendance, half-time, and age of leaving school, have no doubt complicated the search ; but it is not easy to trace the connection between these circumstances and the courses as they exist. And, it should seem, an intimate inquiry into what an average child under ordinary conditions can be reasonably expected to acquire, would be of service in laying out the courses of the different classes.

The influence on school work of an elaborated syllabus is usually of doubtful value. The gain which results from the orderly plotting out of the field of study, finds a counterpoise in the routine character of a teaching effort which is felt to be in part vicarious. And when a syllabus presupposes a capacity which pupils do not possess, or sets forth more to be learned

than time permits, and when, in addition, progress is tested by a rigid examination, little of good can result. For under such circumstances the natural order of learning, which lies in a separating (from the manifold) of elements which are seen to be allied to and an extension of already-existing knowledge, gives way to a haphazard piling up of facts which may not in any way correspond to the pupil's experience. And leisure, too, is lacking for the exercise of the selective faculty working in sub-consciousness, whence springs our idea of congruousness and our first appreciation of inherent value.

No small portion of the confusion of word and thing, of means and end, of process and result, so apparent in the ordinary work of the schools, and the consequent uselessness of school education for after-life has had its rise in the demands of syllabuses and inspectors. And in the department of religious instruction the remark applies with not less force. Here, moreover, the widespread practice of labelling schools as "excellent," "very good," "good," "fair," "moderate," and the need of obtaining a high percentage or correct individual answers as a condition of satisfactory classification have accentuated the evil. An unhealthy rivalry has been set up among schools and departments of schools, a species of charlatanry has been fostered, and the happiness of pupils has been lessened. The insistence, in particular, on an individual and word-perfect repetition of a long list of prayers, and of the three or four score pages of a technically-written Catechism, has impaired the teaching, and has been also the fruitful source of mental and physical suffering to those from

whom Nature has withheld the gift of a quick and retentive memory.

In taking up the teaching of any subject of the school curriculum it is well to realize in advance not only the special value in itself of the information we may convey, but also its probable effect upon the children. And this effect will largely depend upon the way in which the instruction is given. The careful teacher chooses such matter as may be intelligible to his pupils and in harmony with their feelings and interests. He prepares their minds to receive the lesson profitably by evoking the knowledge cognate to it which they already possess, so that his facts may not stand loosely out of context, but be recognized by the pupils as a development and amplification of what they already know. And in the act of presenting the subject-matter of his lesson he aims at the vividness and earnestness which secure attention and stimulate the children to make for themselves a further advance in knowledge.

It is to be feared that the careful pedagogic treatment accorded to secular subjects, which accounts for the progress made in certain directions during recent years, has been for the most part overlooked in the teaching of religion. Yet, surely, it is just here that we have most carefully to weigh what we teach, and with much greater solicitude than in the case of secular instruction must we look to the effect to be produced in the process of teaching : for it is here not merely a question of an advance in intellectual fitness but of nourishing a living faith, of inducing a true piety, and of strengthening the moral fibre.

The religious instruction of the schools is usually ill-

calculated to the attainment of these high ends. It is given indeed with vigour and devotedness, but the exercise of these qualities apart from a true perspective may produce little that is of benefit. And it must be said that the energy of the teacher is largely and inevitably—at times without a consciousness of perversion on his part—devoted to the production of a merely verbal accuracy. Thus religious instruction tends to fall into place as one of a score of subjects of the school curriculum with little to differentiate it from the others save its monotony and its difficulty.

The disadvantage to the child of learning his prayers under these conditions is patent to all. We turn to the Catechism. And here we enter upon debatable ground. For while some urge that the completeness and precision of the Catechism entitle it to a central position in any scheme of religious instruction, others who have carefully observed the effect of the every-day Catechism teaching of schools are dubious of its utility.

To hold the latter view is of course in no way inconsistent with the keenest appreciation of the Catechism as an epitome of Christian Doctrine, for the little book was not written from the standpoint which the teacher of young children is bound to adopt if he means to bring his mind really into touch with the minds of his pupils. An analogy may make the matter clearer. Those readers who are so unfortunate as to have already reached middle life will remember their schoolboy attempts to extract a meaning from a certain confusing and indeterminate writer named Euclid. But they will admit to-day that these adjectives—or their schoolboy equivalents—were undeserved, and that Euclid is

both clear and precise from the standpoint of the adult from which he wrote. And a new generation of teachers is taking this difference into account, and is endeavouring to frame a simpler and more concrete method of teaching the principles which he taught.

With care and patience it may be found possible to devise a procedure whereby the learning of the truths of religion may be in accordance with the child's capacity and development, and fruitful to him. Such a procedure does not lie in the Catechism as it is usually taught. Leaving out of count the hardship involved in the memorizing of it, the time—at least one half of the amount available for religious instruction—spent in the process and the lack of permanence of the matter learnt, two objections at least remain. One of these is the extreme difficulty of making actual to young minds any piece of knowledge by beginning with the definition —which is in the nature of a finished product of thought —and explaining the phraseology of its parts. The other lies in the fact that while the Catechism is ungraded in regard to difficulty of contents it is used as a school-book by all children alike from seven years of age to fourteen. To the reader unused to actual teaching, this matter of gradation may not immediately appeal. A somewhat grotesque illustration will serve to bring home the point. Let him imagine the state of a school where the series of reading-books, which begin with the infant primer and advance almost imperceptibly in difficulty through the succeeding years of the school course, are all laid aside and extracts from standard authors used in all classes, where simple addition, the rule of three, and square-root are taught to

all pupils promiscuously, and where children, without preparation, are immersed in technicalities of botany and physics!

A careful grading of the material of knowledge so as to adapt it to the stage of advancement of the children is a main concern of the teacher. And if we start with an understanding that development is mainly from within we shall at once lay hold on an important truth of method, viz., the inadvisability of (i.) presenting information to a child for which he is not prepared, or of (ii.) stating in the rigid terms suitable to a cultured mind that which is understood best by the child from his own standpoint.

We do, as a matter of fact, make a concession not only to vocabulary, but also to concept, in our common dealings with the little ones. For instance, we allow the policeman to stand merely as the friend of the good and the foe of the wicked: we do not seek to present him either as a humble necessary instrument in a complex system of government, or as an embodiment of our innate striving for that which in the social order is best. We do not interfere with the literature of the nursery, for we recognize that the stories of giants and fairies and dragons are real to the child and show forth truths which it were labour lost to define for him. Indeed, the child allows to pass unchallenged fictions, obvious to him as such, for he is able intuitively to place them in a perspective in which an underlying truth shows most clearly to the immature mind. The wolf *speaks* to Red Riding Hood, and the frogs to the boys who throw stones into the pond, for in the one case the dominating idea is the danger of consorting with evil

company, and in the other the inevitable protest of the weak against the tyranny of the strong. The subject is interesting: it has a counterpart in one direction in the myths of primitive peoples, and in another direction in the peculiarly metaphorical treatment of physical fact which we are forced to employ whenever we attempt to give an account of physical process. But we must not digress. The principle to be grasped is that true instruction is according to the stage of development at which the pupil has arrived, and that in every stage the effective organization of his knowledge must be in terms of his own understanding.

In other words, the dominant note of our teaching must be reality—reality as felt by the child. Now, there are some who have come to feel, in a way, a need for reality, but, from the fact that they have not gained the children's standpoint, construe the term as meaning no more than scientific exactitude. "Why?" for example, ask those of this school, "why do we allow a perpetuation of the fiction of angels' wings?" Why not? It is true the appendages do not bear a close inspection from the adult, scientific point of view. But it has already been shown that the child often gains his truest concept under conditions which have but little to do with fact, and it should seem that to substitute in this case a technical definition of angel in place of the commonly accepted "fiction" would be to walk backwards from reality, and in our regress to unclasp the hand which has guided childhood through all the ages.

It follows as a corollary to reality that the teaching should usually be positive. A teacher has asked the Catechism question, "What is God?" The children

have replied, "God is the supreme Spirit who alone exists of Himself and is infinite in all perfections," and their reply is, perhaps, treated in some such way as the following: "A *spirit* is a living being. It can think and know, and it has free-will. But it has no body; it cannot be seen by us, or felt; it needs neither food nor drink nor house to live in as we do. The angels are spirits. God is the supreme Spirit—*Supreme Spirit*, that is the highest or greatest of all the spirits. No one is so high, so great, as God—*alone exists of Himself*, lives, continues to be, without help from any one. We need help in order to live, help from our parents who provide us with home and food and clothing, and help especially from God, by whom all these good things are in the first place given. But God needs no help from any one. And there is no other but God who can thus exist of himself—*infinite*, without end or limit—*infinite in all perfections*, there is no end or limit to the good qualities, or attributes, of God—to His wisdom, His goodness, His power." This explanation, which is not unrepresentative of its class, can hardly be looked upon as satisfactory: it is made up largely of negations, and the central idea is obscured by the prominence given to its parts.

But even should the instructor manage to steer clear of the bare rock of negation, yet is there—so long as he limits his effort to the explication of Catechism terms—imminent danger of being caught in the vortex of verbalism. He is dealing with, for instance, the last clause of the definition just quoted. He shows first a school-book which has seen some wear: pages are missing—it is not *perfect;* then a penknife, of which a

blade is broken : it, too, is *imperfect ;* next, he draws freehand, on the blackboard, a simple geometrical figure ; he trims it with care, and eventually, by use of ruler and compasses, he evolves the square or circle. Here, indeed, in a sense, is *perfection* realized and made visible. And yet the explanation has done little or nothing to supply the child with an answer to the question, "What is God?" The lesson may have been excellent as a lesson in English or geometry, but such instruction is not religious instruction.

How far removed is all this from the kind of teaching made use of by our Lord, who in parable, in miracle, in illustration from nature and every-day occurrence, makes the truth patent, concrete, and real, even to the simplest of His hearers. In place of definition, He gives us description : God is a Father whose care extends even to the meanest of His creatures ; and He is *our* Father. He is a King besides ; His kingdom is Heaven, where the blessed do His will, as we, too, must do if we would enter into the kingdom. All we can have is from God, and we are to ask Him for all that we need—for our daily bread, forgiveness of our sins, deliverance from the wiles of the wicked one, and from every evil.

It seems clear that under existing conditions the ordinary every-day teaching of Catechism in the schools tends not a little to obscure the true purport of religious instruction. Some remedy may be found practicable in the substitution of a simplified form more adapted to the capacity of children, and by the omission of the more difficult sections from the courses of the younger pupils. And still more if instructors

can be made to feel the need in their lessons of working up to the definitions, and of having them then memorized as a formulation of what has been taught. For, indeed, to begin with the ready-made definition and to comment loosely on its grammatical parts, is a slipshod method only too readily adopted by those who are inclined to make use of the labour of others in order to save themselves the trouble of thinking out suitable lessons.

The question of Catechism teaching merits the careful and first-hand study of all engaged in the religious training of the young. And it is, without doubt, a question of how the Catechism may be used with the greatest advantage, and not of its employment as against other possible forms of instruction. For at any moment the teacher may need an exact statement of the truth which he is attempting to explain, and he must have to hand also a concise and authoritative exposition of the whole field of Christian Doctrine. And this means of guidance will become even more necessary if the efforts made in certain directions to restrict the work of the day-school staff to the teaching of secular subjects should meet with any measure of success, for in that case the religious instruction will have to be given largely by imperfectly trained volunteers. Not less necessary is it, too, that the child should have his information fixed and made precise and should have stored up in his memory a form of words by which he can upon occasion express unmistakably that which he feels and knows.

.

To summarize. Present circumstances call for

special effort in safeguarding and improving the religious instruction of the schools. In view of a reduction of the time available for direct religious training it may be well to modify existing schemes, so as to limit the field of instruction and to concentrate effort on what is of most importance.

Success in teaching depends on the kind of procedure employed. The methods of imparting secular knowledge have improved greatly, but not much has been done to improve the procedure of religious instruction, and it is for the most part routinary and antiquated. An exercise of skill in the teaching will mean simplicity and interest in the process and reality and permanence in the result.

All this, however, goes a part of the way only. In dealing with the ordinary subjects of the school curriculum it is no small part of the teacher's aim to prepare the pupil to display his knowledge for the credit of the school and as a means of advancement in after-life. In the religious instruction, on the other hand, these considerations can have but an obscure place. The attitude of the teacher should make manifest the difference, and should bring before the child the sacredness and dignity of the subject. And the whole trend of the teaching should be towards an appreciation of religious truth and the formation of a lasting habit of virtue.

As conducing to these ends it is well to connect closely the daily religious instruction with the spiritual life of the children. To take a rough illustration : the fixing in memory of the common prayers will be sought in the devotional every-day repetition of them as a

religious exercise rather than in a formal drill where rigidity of expression takes the first place. Other forms of prayer will be best learned at times when their use is seen to be necessary or fitting. If, for instance, the Litany of our Lady is publicly recited on her feast-days, and as occasion arises, the *De profundis* for the souls of departed relatives and friends of the children, the amount of learning-by-rote will be lessened and a truer meaning of the prayers will become apparent. And the "drill" which may be necessary as a supplement will then be looked on by the child not as a mere task, but as a means to enable him at fitting times to do that which he sees to be desirable. The application of this principle is even more striking in the treatment of hymns, and, indeed, there is hardly a phase in the religious instruction of schools into which it may not effectively enter.

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON.

EDUCATION, TRUE AND FALSE [1]

By WILLIAM SAMUEL LILLY,
Honorary Fellow of Peterhouse, Cambridge.

I suppose no one will deny that liberty, popular government, and the power of public opinion, if they are to prove a blessing and not a curse to any country, require the elevation of the people generally in ethical qualities and tone of mind. "We must educate our masters," said Lord Sherbrooke. The familiar dictum seems like the very voice of the *Zeitgeist*. Indeed, there is nothing upon which this age of ours prides itself more than its educational activity. The schoolmaster is abroad, and has been for a great many years past. The expenditure upon popular Education is a heavy item in the budget of every civilized country and is daily becoming heavier. "Educate, educate, educate," is everywhere the cry; "only educate enough and we shall in time get a blessed new world and bring in the golden age." No shibboleth of the day is more frequently repeated, or more highly honoured than this of Education. Nor can there be a doubt that the zeal for it is excellent and worthy of all commendation. But I may be permitted to doubt whether it is always, one might, perhaps, say often, a zeal according to knowledge: whether

[1] By the kind permission of Messrs. Chapman and Hall, these pages are reprinted, with a few alterations and omissions, from the Author's work *On Shibboleths*.

it is not frequently expended upon what is not Education at all, but a mere counterfeit thereof. The point is worth discussing.

What then is, as a rule, meant when Education is spoken of? What but the instruction, in greater or less degree, of the intellect? Every one is now taught some things, be it only the three Rs, although, in most countries, the primary schools have got far beyond that. In schools of a higher grade the number of things which a scholar may learn, and is encouraged to learn, is very great, the usual result being his acquisition of a large amount of small information at the cost of much cerebral fatigue. In the Universities, Professors lecture on all things human and divine, and the whole field of human knowledge is open to the student. It is an age of universal instruction, and it is an age of universal examination. The examiner extracts what the schoolmaster has put in, and satisfies us that we have the worth of our money. Now I am far from denying that from the humblest schools, as from the highest colleges, many youths are sent into the world who are educated in what I must account the only proper sense of the word: a sense which I shall presently indicate. But I do say that a student may answer with absolute correctness the questions set to test his proficiency in the subjects wherein he has been instructed, that, in Lord Tennyson's phrase, he may be "gorged with knowledge," and yet be quite uneducated. Mere instruction is not sufficient even to form the intellect. Still less sufficient is it to form the character. But the formation of the character is the true end of Education.

I lay no claim to originality in putting forward this view. I find it expressed, clearly enough, in a verse of the Book of Proverbs, as rendered by King James's translators: "Train up a child in the way he should go, and when he is old he will not depart from it." A youth that is so trained is educated. He is fitted for the work appointed him in this world, whatever it may be, which, indeed, is a matter of comparatively little importance.

"Honour and shame from no condition rise;
Act well your part: therein all honour lies."

And so the majestic words of Milton: "I call, therefore, a complete and generous education that which fits a man to perform justly, skilfully, and magnanimously all the offices, both public and private, of peace and war." The true ideal of Education is the right development of all the human powers and faculties, its function being, as Herbert Spencer well says, "to prepare us for complete living." This development must be simultaneous and harmonious, for the undue predominance of one power or faculty is necessarily attended by the degeneration or atrophy of others. Hence Plato, Aristotle, and the philosophers of the Porch were led to place virtue—man's distinctive excellence and perfection—in a mean, that is, in a proper balance or accord of all his endowments. "All that makes a man" should be recognized in manly Education. "*Mens sana in corpore sano*"—a sound mind in a sound body—was the aspiration of the Roman poet; and it was not unwise. Physical culture is important as the instrument of that corporal soundness which enters into the virile ideal. "To remove the original dimness of the mind's eye; to strengthen and perfect its vision; to enable it to look out into the world, right forward, steadily and truly; to give the mind clearness, accuracy, precision; to enable it to use words aright; to understand what it says; to conceive justly what it thinks;"[1] is, according to Cardinal Newman, the object of intellectual Education: an object which every teacher, from the village schoolmaster to the University Professor, should keep in view. But much more than this enters into the conception of the sound mind. Man is not merely an intellectual but also a moral being. That is his distinctive prerogative separating him, far more decisively than physical or mental differences, from the lower animals, and crowning him with glory and worship. Of all the ideals that man can set before him, the moral idea comes first, because all other ideals, the ideal of knowledge among

[1] *The Idea of a University*, p. 322 (Third Ed.).

the rest, hold of it. In every circumstance, action, or emotion of life, there is an ethical issue: Am I right in being here? in doing this? in thinking that? There is no situation that has not its duty. The moral ideal embraces our entire being: all other ideals but segments thereof. It is at the very centre of consciousness, for, only as an ethical being is man a person. And the supreme end of educating a child is to educe his personality, "to make a man of him," as we are wont to say. That only satisfies the philosophical conception of Education—

> "Where all, as in a work of art,
> Is toil, co-operant to an end."

Let us pursue the matter a little further. What is the first lesson that should be taught a child? Yes: and the last too? We may call it the Alpha and Omega of Education. Surely it is reverence. Reverence for what is highest above him. Reverence for what is highest in him. And it is a lesson which the child is naturally disposed to learn. It corresponds to a primary instinct of human nature. An opinion has largely prevailed—attributable, I suppose, to the Calvinistic doctrine of our total depravity—that man is born entirely under the dominion of egoism, of self-seeking, of covetousness, and that Education consists in revolutionizing his innate character. But this view is the outcome of false dogma and superficial observation. It is as erroneous as the Rousseauan view that man is by nature altogether good. He is neither altogether good nor altogether bad. He is imperfect: able to discern and to admire the things that are more excellent: unable, through defect of will and nature, adequately to follow after them. Consider a child, as everyday experience reveals him—nay, much as children differ, through the influence of heredity, I would almost say *any* child—and what is its strongest motive? Surely the desire for esteem. And that desire may well be considered the original spring of right action. It first displays itself in the wish to be thought well of by those who naturally command the child's reverence. The approbation of his parents, and

in particular—which is noteworthy—of the less tender of the two, the father, is necessary to his peace of mind. It represents to him, Hegel well says, his own better will, and therefore it has a rightful claim upon his obedience. Their judgement mirrors him to himself. It reflects his own worthiness or unworthiness. As years go on, the judgements of others, of his tutors and governors, his companions and friends, come also to weigh with him. The note of virile maturity is that the rule and measure of self-respect is transferred from without to within. He finds his standard, not in the praise of men, but in the idea of the Right, the Just, the True: in the testimony of his conscience, in his thoughts accusing or else excusing one another, as he falls short of, or corresponds with, that idea. Hence culture of the will is a far more important part of Education than culture of the intellect, for will is of the essence of personality, in virtue of which man is man. Duty is, as Kant excellently teaches, the obligation to act from pure reverence of the moral law. And a good will is a will self-determined by that law.

> "Self-reverence, self-knowledge, self-control—
> These three alone lead life to sovereign power."

The truly educated man, be he peasant or prince, is he who has learned to know his duty, and whose whole powers have been disciplined and developed to the utmost for its accomplishment. That is the ideal of virile maturity. Doubtless, it is never entirely attained. The very nature of the ideal forbids that complete objective reality can ever be given to it by man. We must account of it as the type to which we can but approximate, more or less nearly. And just in proportion as any one does approximate to this idea of virile maturity is he "man, and master of his fate.' Just in that proportion is he educated.

But in the popular conception of Education this moral element, this discipline of the will has no place. I have described that conception as being "the instruction of the intellect, in greater or less degree"; an instruction, in

many cases, wholly or chiefly directed to the attainment of what Lord Goschen has called "saleable knowledge." And, what is most singular, from such instruction ethical results are confidently expected. Ignorance is held to be the root of all evil. Knowledge—literary, scientific, æsthetic—is exhibited as an universal remedy or panacea, as a quickening, regenerating, organizing power, able to transform individual and national character. All which appears to me gross and irrational superstition. It passes my wit to understand how moral improvement is to be the outcome of merely intellectual culture; of knowledge, however wide and exact, of arts or literature or physics. How can such knowledge affect character? It cannot minister to a mind diseased. It cannot convert the will from bad to good. The utmost it can do is to minister to an enlightened selfishness. It leaves you ethically where it found you, unless, indeed, its effect has been to illustrate the Apostolic dictum, "Knowledge puffeth up." That such is the usual effect of instruction divorced from reverence cannot, indeed, be doubted. I remember John Ruskin once saying to me that, in his judgement, what is commonly called Education is little better than a training in impudence. It ministers to the excessive individualism of an age when the man in the streets supposes himself qualified, by his modicum of elementary instruction, to give sentence on all things in heaven and earth, and resents it, as flat blasphemy, if the sufficiency of the purblind private prejudice which he calls his judgement is so much as questioned. More than fifty years ago, Flaubert, in one of his letters to George Sand, prophesied, "Free and compulsory instruction will merely increase the number of fools." The event, in France, has proved the correctness of his prediction. This by the way. My present point is, that instruction of the intellect has, in itself, no moralizing tendency. It may turn crime into different channels, and render it less easy to detect, it may make a man more decent, but it does not change his natural propensities or his proneness to gratify them at the expense of others. Physical science, literature, art, may refine the judgement and elevate the taste. But

here their power ends. The utmost they can do is to minister to an enlightened selfishness. Knowledge of them is, in fact, power, and nothing else. Its practical effect is to make the good man more powerful for good, the bad man more powerful for evil. And that is all it does or can do.

If ever there was a safe truth, it is this. And I know of few things more curious than the blindness to it exhibited by many who are accounted, and in other respects justly, among our wisest. I remember, upon one occasion, hearing a very learned judge pass sentence upon two criminals, one a country doctor, the other an agricultural labourer, who had been equally concerned in an offence the monstrous turpitude of which must be patent even to the simplest. In sentencing the doctor the judge said, "You are an educated man, and ought to have known better: I shall therefore award to you a longer term of penal servitude than to your fellow-prisoner." As though the possessor of medical and surgical knowledge might equitably be punished for not attaining to a higher ethical standard than the peasant. It was a striking instance of the belief that moralizing effects may reasonably be expected from intellectual instruction: a belief which, as Herbert Spencer well points out in his *Study of Sociology*, while "absurd *a priori*," is "flatly contradicted by facts." Criminal statistics exhibit more crime among skilled than among unskilled labourers. The less instructed peasants in the fields are, it would seem, better morally than the more instructed artizans in the streets. The schoolmaster, abroad for so many years, has not proved the moral regenerator that he was expected to be. Let us see how the expectation arose.

It appears to me to have directly arisen from the Utilitarian philosophy, which resolves morality into self-interest. "Honesty," the teachers of this school insist, "is the best policy; and a thing is honest because it is supremely politic." The practical conclusion is that, virtue being enlightened selfishness, men will be virtuous out of regard for their own interests, if the eyes of their understanding are only sufficiently opened to discern what their

true interests are. And so John Stuart Mill apparently regarded the end of Education as being, "to diffuse good sense among the people, with such knowledge as would qualify them to judge of the tendencies of their actions."[1] The conception of Education held by Utilitarians is essentially mechanical. How should it embrace the culture of the will if, as they one and all teach, from Bentham down to Herbert Spencer, the freedom of the will is an objective and subjective delusion? It looks without, to mechanism, for what can be effected only by dealing with the springs of action within. The Utilitarian philosophy de-ethicises Education, as it de-ethicises everything else, by banishing the moral idea. For Utilitarian morality, in all its shapes and forms, is not moral at all. From agreeable feeling, the laws of comfort, needs personal or racial, the interests, whether of the individual or of the community, it is impossible to extract an atom of morality.[2] Right differs from expediency in its very essence. "I ought," never does and never can mean "it is pleasantest for thee, or for me, or for all of us." The only morality derivable from pleasure is the morality of money, for which pleasures of all kinds, intellectual and physical, may be purchased. The moral law is dethroned by Utilitarianism. The Almighty Dollar is exalted in its place, in the schoolroom as in the market-place. Mammon is the present deity: and "Put money in thy purse," is his gospel generally received and believed by this generation. "The idols of the Gentiles are silver and gold, the works of the hands of men. Let them that make them become like unto them, and all such as trust in them."

In such an age, I hold it of the utmost importance to insist upon the true conception of Education. To Education, that is really such—a stern, high, ethical discipline—must we look for the cleansing of the land from

[1] *Principles of Political Economy*, Book II. c. xiii. § 3.

[2] I have pursued this subject, at some length, in chap. ii. of my work *On Right and Wrong*, and in chap. iv. of my work *The Great Enigma*.

that debasing Mammon-worship which strikes at the root of the qualities specially needed by a democracy. "To make the people fittest to choose, and the chosen fittest to govern, will be to mend our corrupt and faulty education, to teach the people faith, not without virtue, temperance, modesty, sobriety, parsimony, justice."[1] These golden words of Milton should be inscribed on every schoolhouse in the kingdom. Universal Education is the natural consequence of popular government. It is only just to the leaders of the great Revolution which ushered in the present era, to say that they discerned this truth. The National Assembly declared teaching a sacred function and the schoolmaster the equal of the priest. It affirmed that the first charge upon the public revenues should be public instruction; and the Convention voted fifty-four millions of francs for this purpose. It is true that the vote was mere waste paper, for the money was not forthcoming. But the intention of the Revolutionary legislators was thereby put on record: and who can deny its reasonableness? All men, in virtue of their fundamental equality, should start, as far as may be, equal in the race of life, each with his fair chance to make the best of himself: to secure the benefit of that most righteous principle, "a career for talents." A man is not really free in the present state of society to develop his faculties to the greatest advantage of himself and of the community, without teaching of a much higher kind than would have sufficed for him in a simpler age. Nor, again, is he qualified for the exercise of that political power which modern democracy puts into his hands, save by Education in the complete sense for which I have been contending. Mere intellectual instruction is not sufficient. Herbert Spencer justly notes, in his volume from which I have already quoted, "the ample disproof, if there needed any, of the notion that men are fitter for the right exercise of power by teaching." Power is a trust, for the due fulfilment of which it is not enough that a man know rightly. He must also *will* rightly: that is, his volition must be

[1] *The Ready Way to Establish a Free Commonwealth.*

determined by the moral law. Ethical culture, the very keystone of Education, is, from the political point of view, absolutely necessary.

And this brings us face to face with one of the most momentous practical questions of the day. How is it possible to ensure for a country that moral and intellectual discipline which shall "make the people fittest to choose and the chosen fittest to govern"? That this is a matter of vital interest to the social organism, and that therefore it ought to be cared for by the State, is certain. "Do you imagine," said Plato, "that polities grow on a tree, or on a rock, and not out of the moral dispositions of the men who compose them?" "The first element of good government," echoes a philosopher of our own day, "being the virtue and intelligence of the human beings comprising the community, the most important form of excellence which any form of government can possess is to promote the virtue and intelligence of the people themselves."[1] Certain it is that the nation, as an organic whole, is most deeply interested in the Education of its children. That to undertake it is not, primarily, the proper function of the State, is no less certain. It is the duty and prerogative of parents, and especially of the father, as the head and personification of the family, to ensure for a child that degree of moral and intellectual culture which shall enable him to quit him like a man in the business of life. The doctrine of the *patria potestas* is no figment of superannuated superstition. However rude and stern the forms which it assumed in antique civilizations, it is rooted and grounded in the nature of things. The father is, by divine right, the Priest, Judge, and King in his own family. Of all jurisdiction exercised in this world, his is the most sacred, for he is the direct and indefeasible representative of Him "of whom all paternity in heaven and earth is named." Tyrannously as his authority may have been exercised in the archaic family, it is now the bulwark of liberty. True is the instinct which leads our Courts of

[1] Mill, *On Representative Government*, p. 31.

Law so jealously to guard it, that by no agreement, however solemn, can he divest himself of it. For it exists not only for his own sake, not only for the sake of his children, but for the sake of the community as well. The whole of social life is based upon the family. Nor in this age of dissolvent individualism can we insist too strongly upon the sacredness and inviolability of those paternal rights which form its foundation.

But sacred and indefeasible as are, in theory, a father's rights and prerogatives in respect of his children's Education, what if he neglect the duties involved in those rights and make no account of those prerogatives? That this frequently happens is matter of the commonest experience. Nor can it be otherwise, by reason of the abject poverty and deep degradation in which so many families exist. I need not enlarge upon what is, unhappily, too familiar. Certain it is, that if the Education of children were left entirely to their fathers, who are primarily and directly responsible for it, a vast number would remain wholly uneducated, and so unfitted for their life-work in general, and, in particular, for the discharge of their political duties in a democratic polity. Equally certain it is, that this is opposed to the best interests of the social organism; that it is a mischief which the nation, in its corporate capacity, should strenuously combat. The State is bound to undertake the Education of children who, without its intervention, would receive no Education.

But how can the State teach "virtue, temperance, modesty, sobriety, parsimony, justice"? How can it supply that moral element which is the most vital part of Education? Is there, as a matter of fact, any other instrument of ethical culture possible for the mass of mankind, but religion? I admit, or rather I strenuously maintain, that the fundamental doctrines of morality are independent of all religious systems. They are the necessary and eternal truths of reason. But so viewed they are merely intellectual. They are diagrams. In order to vivify them, there needs emotion; there needs enthusiasm; there needs celestial fire. I am not here considering Education as it affects man's prospects and destinies beyond the

grave. I am viewing it from the standpoint of this life only. And so viewed, I say that religion is a sort of centre of gravity of human knowledge. It is the greatest source of moral authority in this world, because it is, according to Kant's admirable definition, "the representation to ourselves of the moral law as the will of God." Can morality work upon the world at large without such representation? Can we banish the vision of the Creator, Witness and Judge of men, from our schoolrooms and not enfeeble, yes, emasculate, the whole of the teaching given there? M. Renan, an unsuspected witness, thinks not. "The peasant without religion," he declares, "is the ugliest of brutes, no longer possessing the distinctive token of human nature." [1]

And this confronts us with a grave practical difficulty in an age of religious disunity. In the present day a common creed and a common cult no longer supply the bond of states and the rule of legislation. Religion is no longer the great objective fact, dominating all relations of life. "Religions," said Turgot, "are opinions; and therefore there ought not to be a dominant religion. Right and justice for all alone should dominate." This declaration, regarded when it was made, in the eighteenth century, as a perilous paradox, is now accepted as the tritest of truisms. And the State has everywhere been secularized in accordance with it. Religion is regarded as a private thing for every man's conscience. He may have any variety of it which he prefers, and as much or as little of it as he pleases. But the State, *qua* State, has no religion, although maintaining the free exercise of all religions. It professes itself (in the French phrase) incompetent in the matter of cults, and displays, or affects to display, benevolent neutrality towards them all. I, for my part, do not pretend to admire this condition of things, so loudly eulogized by many as the ripe fruit of liberty, a high stage of progress, a magnificent conquest of the modern mind.

[1] *L'Avenir de la Religion*, p. 487.

It appears to me, as a student of history, that a national religion is a great national safeguard, and, as a student of philosophy, that it is necessary to the perfection of the social organism. And I believe that, as time goes on, the want of it will be increasingly felt in every country. But whether I am right or wrong in so thinking, certain it is that one great problem lying before modern society is to reconcile the authority of religious convictions with the Agnosticism of governments. And how, to speak merely of our present subject, is it possible for the State to obtain the aid of religion as an instrument of ethical culture, while maintaining its attitude of religious neutrality?

It has been observed, not without truth, that if you wish to recommend any course of action to Englishmen generally, there is no better device than to commend it as a middle course. The solution adopted by us of the religious difficulty in Education given by the State possesses this recommendation. To banish religion altogether from the "provided" Schools was repugnant to the instincts of piety, happily so strong in the English people. On the other hand, to teach there any existing variety of Christianity was clearly impossible. And so a new variety which, it was supposed, would not hurt the most sensitive Nonconformist conscience, was invented. It permits the Bible to be taught, but excludes all formularies. It is, in truth, Theism plus a certain amount of Christian sentiment. And its special recommendation is held to be that it is undogmatic. As a matter of fact, it is not so. The total banishment of dogmas would mean infinite conjecture The existence of God, or the authority, in however attenuated a form, of the Bible, is as much a dogma as Transubstantiation or Justification by Faith alone. But the dogmas of this new religion are few, and they are not obtruded. I suppose its practical effect is to instil into the minds of children that sense of Divine Providence, that habit of endeavouring to trace it in all events, which are distinctive of the Hebrew Scriptures, and to familiarize them with the sacred scenes and pregnant precepts of the Evangelical history. I by no means incline to undervalue

such Biblical training. It seems to me that, as a matter of fact, it brings home, more or less effectively, to many who receive it the highest and most operative ideals. Those august lessons from beyond the grave, uttered, as it were, from the realms of eternity, can hardly fail to introduce an element of poetry and morality into many lives. I am, of course, very far from allowing that such religion is a satisfactory substitute for the definite instruction in faith and practice which every Christian community more or less fully and precisely gives. But I do assert that, as compared with no religious teaching at all, it is something considerable: and that it is more than a State, which has ceased to be distinctively Christian, if acting within its logic, could fairly be expected to give to the children whose Education, through their parents' default, it is itself obliged to undertake.

Assuredly, however, the State has no right, directly or (which is much more likely) indirectly, to impose this religion upon any children whose parents prefer more definite teaching. It is for the parents, not for the State, to choose what religion their children shall be taught. The Denominational system (as it is called) is the only system possible in this country which is consistent with the father's rights, which respects his religious liberty. But those rights and that liberty are not absolute. They are conditioned by the rights and needs of the social organism. The same principles which warrant the State in undertaking the Education of children who, otherwise, would not be educated at all, also warrant it in requiring that the intellectual instruction of the nation shall come up to a certain standard. "A government," to quote John Stuart Mill, "is justified in requiring from all the people that they shall possess instruction in certain things, but not in prescribing to them how, or from whom, they shall obtain it."[1] Does it, however, follow that Education thus enforced by the State should be paid for by the State? By no means. The function of the State is to define the public

[1] *Principles of Political Economy*, Book V. chap. xi. § 9.

duties of the subject. Upon the subject lies the obligation of performing those duties, at his own proper cost and charges. But unquestionably the principle of social solidarity requires that those who, while doing their best for the Education of their children, are unable to comply with the legitimate requirements of the State should be assisted from the public funds in the fulfilment of that duty. The cry raised against the aid thus given to Denominational schools as an indirect endowment of religion is absurd. With religion, as a Divine revelation, the unreligious State is not concerned. With religions as teachers of morality, it is deeply concerned, and such teaching it may justly subsidize. The great practical difficulty arises in the endeavour to discriminate between those who cannot and those who will not help themselves in the Education of their children. The true justification of "Free Education" is that it is the best possible solution of that and other difficulties, and a boon which, in virtue of social solidarity, may very properly be conferred upon the poorer classes, at the expense of the community at large. Again, the right of the State to satisfy itself as to the quality of the Education given in elementary schools does not primarily arise from its pecuniary grants in aid of them. The true reason for the public control of Education is not that public funds are used for it, but that it is a thing of vital importance to public interests. Nor, in my opinion, can such control be properly entrusted to Local Boards. The matter is of imperial concern, and should be as directly ordered by the State as are the Army and Navy, or the various departments of the Civil Service.

So much may suffice to indicate what appears to me the true principle which should regulate this matter of such vast importance to the public weal. But I would not pass away from the subject without noting how necessary it is, in the highest interests of the body politic, that the functions of Government in respect of Education should be jealously restricted within the limits which I have, as I trust clearly, however roughly, traced. The replacement of the

Denominational system by what is called "a national system," sometimes advocated in the name of liberty, would really be a deadly blow to liberty. It would bring about a liberty which is not liberal: a liberty *à la Française*. There are certain weighty words of John Stuart Mill so well worthy at being pondered in this connection, that I cannot end better than by citing them:

"That the whole or any large part of the education of the people should be in State hands, I go as far as any one in deprecating. All that has been said of the importance of individuality of character, and diversity of opinions and modes of conduct, involves, as of the same unspeakable importance, diversity of education. A general State education is a mere contrivance for moulding people to be exactly like one another: and as the mould in which it casts them is that which pleases the predominant power in the Government, whether this be a monarch, a priesthood, an aristocracy, or the majority of the existing generation, in proportion as it is efficient and successful, it establishes a despotism over the mind, leading by natural tendency to one over the body. An education established and controlled by the State should only exist, if it exist at all, as one among many competing experiments, carried on for the purpose of example and stimulus, to keep the others up to a certain standard of excellence. Unless, indeed, when society in general is in so backward a state that it could not or would not provide for itself any proper institutions of education, unless the Government undertook the task—then, indeed, the Government may, as the less of two great evils, take upon itself the business of schools and universities, as it may that of joint-stock companies, when private enterprise, in a shape fitted for undertaking great works of industry, does not exist in the country. But in general, if the country contains a sufficient number of persons qualified to provide education under Government auspices, the same persons would be able and willing to give an equally good education on the voluntary principle, under the assurance of remuneration afforded by law rendering education compulsory, combined with State aid to those unable to defray the expense.

"The instrument for enforcing the law could be no other than public examinations, extending to all children, and beginning at an early age. . . . Under this system the rising generation . . . would be brought up either Churchmen or Dissenters as they now are, the State merely taking care that they should be instructed Churchmen, or instructed Dissenters."[1]

[1] *On Liberty*, chap. v. There is a striking passage to the same effect in Mill's *Principles of Political Economy*, Book V. chap. xi. § 8

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY, LONDON

CATHOLICS and education.

LC-
116
.G7C2

